
Imprimatur Liber cui Titulus,
A Discourse concerning the Nature of Ido-
latry, &c.

Ex Ædib. Lambeth,
Febr. 18. 1687.

Gnil. Needham, R. R.
in Christo P. ac D.D.
Wilhelmo Archiepisc.
Cam. à Sacr. Domest.

479.9.57

A
DISCOURSE
Concerning the
Nature of Idolatry:
In which a
Late Author's
True and Onely
NOTION of IDOLATRY
IS
Considered and Confuted.

Si inter solas Pontificias versaver, &c. i. e. If I conversed with none but
Papists, and considered their Religion corrupted with Old Wives
Tales, and were altogether destitute of a Rule of Faith, by which
to discern the vast difference between the Christian Religion, and the
Trifles of Popery; and lastly, if no Histories were extant, shewing
how these Doctrines crept in: If it were thus, I say, then I frankly
confess, that I should very much suspect the Christian Religion, nay
I should utterly reject it as foolish and mean, and beneath the esteem
of old Gossips; nor should I less have the name of Christianity, than
I do that of Popery.

Testam. Physic. Theol. Auth. Samuelis Parkeri, P. 4.

LONDON: Printed for William Rogers, at the Sign over against
St. Dunstons Church in Fleet-street. MDC LXXXVIII.

22 Daffodil Church in West Street. MADISONVILLE.

PREFACE.

Were we to judge of the *Merits* of a *Book* merely by the *good Opinions* which the *Author* seems to have of it, we might reasonably believe, that the *Discourse* concerning the *Nature of Idolatry*, which I am about to consider, was not only set forth in *Defense* of a truly *Infallible Church*, but that the *Author* of it thought himself delivering nothing but *Oracles* all the while he was composing of it.

- If his *Reasons* had born proportion to the nature of his Attempt, we should easily have forgiven him, or rather we should have thanked him, no less than the *Gentlemen* of the *Roman Communion* would have done in such a case. He does indeed Treat men with Contempt, whom all the *World* knows to be above his Contempt, nor can I believe him to be so

B

singu-

The PREFACE.

singular as not to know it himself; but yet had he *reasoned* well, we had yielded to him: for an over-bearing Spirit in an Adversary, neither makes us to submit to a bad Argument, nor to resist a good one.

It seemed something strange, that that Author should think to Trample upon us now, for pretending that the Church of Rome has defined *Transubstantiation* as 'tis understood by us, and that she has established an Idolatrous Worship in her Communion: For not only the greatest Persons of the Reformed Religion have brought this Charge against her, but to the truth of it himself has subscribed in his time. But it was much more amazing to find so new a Confidence supported by Arguments so weak, that 'tis not without reason that some of the Roman Communion are said to complain, That they have been Betrayed, rather than Defended by him.

How unsuccessfully he has managed his Design of Expounding *Transubstantiation*, has been shewn in a late Discourse proving *Transubstantiation* to be the peculiar Doctrine of the Church of Rome, and in the *Preface* to the *Examination* of the New Articles of the Roman Creed

The PREFACE.

iii

Creed by *Catholic Tradition*. If I make it appear that he has miscarried as much in the point of *Idolary*, his *Theological* part will then be considered; and for the rest, we do not by any means presume to meddle with it.

As for the Subject which I have undertaken, one would have thought, that a man who resolved to despise all that had ever written upon it, and not according to his *Opinion*, should have taken care, if not to produce something that could not be *Answer'd*, yet at least not to offer any thing that had been already *Confuted*.

But on the contrary, this Author, after all this noise, has for the most part been only an humble Transcriber of the Old *Exploded Pretences*; and which I may truly say were much more *strongly*, as well as more *modestly* urged by Dr. *Godden* against his learned Adversary. And when I consider how much more roughly this Author uses him, than that Doctor did, I am apt to think it might in some measure proceed from the sence he had that Dr. *St.* in discovering the *Sophistry* of his Old Antagonist, had before-hand confuted whatever this New one could find out again to revive the Controversie.

B 2

And

And for this I shall leave the following *Discourse* to be my Evidence; and of which I shall say no more here, than that in his own phrase:

Page 135.

'I have delivered my Judgment, as I will answer for my *Integrity* to God and the *World*. But now there is another thing, which I ought not in this place to pass by. It has been insinuated by this hot *Reasoner*, as no small Crime in us, that we charge the *Church of Rome* with Idolatry, 'Not only (says he) because of the *falseness* of the *Calumny*, but the barbarous consequence that may follow upon it, to incite and warrant the *Rabble*, whenever Opportunity favours, to destroy the *Roman Catholics* and their *Images*, as the *Israelites* were commanded to destroy the *Canaanites* and their *Idols*. And in the next Page he tells us,

Page 72.

73. 74.

'That this Charge of *Idolatry* has ever been set up as the *Standard* against *Monarchy*. I need

not say there are many more Passages of the like kind, in which he exercises his *Gift* of *Eloquence*: for I dare say he never learnt it, unless he has in his time studied to imitate a *Tempest*; for I know not what other Original he could propound to himself. This *Style* is the fittest in the *World* to his purpose, and will per-

THE PREFACE.

perhaps be a Copy for the future to them that intend to speak neither according to *Charity* nor *Truth*; which are ever best heard in a *Calm*.

But however, if this too were for the *declaration* of his *Judgment*, we will no more complain of the *Violence* of his *Expressions*, than we do of the *Force* of his *Arguments*; only I would beg leave to say, that he should have been sure he could *discharge* the *Church of Rome* of that *Guilt*, before he had fix'd a *Mark of Calumny* upon the whole *Body* of the *Reform'd*, who accuse them of it, lest when men examine his *Proofs*, and find them defective, they be tempted to retort the *Censures*, especially considering with what *Freedom* and *Violence* he has been pleased to lay it upon us.

But now for his great fear that this should incite the *Rabble* to any *Violence* against those of the other *Communion*, I dare venture to say, there is not the least reason to be at all apprehensive of it. He knows very well how free the *Christians* of the first three *Centuries* were in laying the very same *Charge* against the *Gentile World*; and yet we do not find

The PREFACE

find that they ever shew'd themselves either the less obedient to their *Emperours*, or the less charitable to their *Neighbours*, upon the account of it. And though I am verily perswaded that the *Romanists*, in the *Invocation of Saints*, and in the *Worship of Images and Reliques*, and of the *Host*, are guilty of *Idolatry*; yet I thank God I am not conscious to my self of one *disloyal* Thought to my *King*, or of the least *Uncharitableness* towards any of my *Country-men*, who differ from me in these *Particulars*.

And what I can thus truly profess in my own behalf, I doubt not but I may do for all others the *true* and *genuine Members* of the *Church of England*; and who by being such, must, I am sure by *Principle*, be both *Obedient Subjects*, and *Charitable Christians*. As for this Author, he has made as broad a sign that he intends to leave us, by insinuating, that the Charge of *Idolatry* ought to be followed with *Blows*, as by his concern not to have *Idolatry* charged upon the *Church of Rome*. We who do protest against certain Practices as *Idolatrous*, do also protest against violating either *Loyalty* or *Charity*, upon the
account

account of Religion. This Author, it seems, likes us neither upon one account, nor the other; or this at least is to be said, that he has been thus long of our Communion, and has not all this while understood what we teach concerning a Christian's Duty to his Neighbour.

Did we indeed profess that of Idolatry, which some others do of Heresie, that 'tis a sufficient Ground for the Excommunicating of a King, and Absolving his Subjects of their Allegiance; had we ever been caught not in *Otesian Conspiracies*, but in *Real Plots* against our Sovereign upon this account, there might then have been just cause for such an *Insurrection*. But whilst our Principles are so Loyal, that we have even been laugh'd at for our asserting them, and that too by some of those who would now be thought so zealous for their Princes Safety; it was a very unreasonable Apprehension, to think that the Charge of Idolatry (and that too begun in the time of a Prince of whom it was Misprision of Treason, but to say that he was guilty of it) should in the bottom have been the designe against the Monarchy, which we have so often declared, and

and in the very Person of our present King have shewn, we think our selves obliged to support, whatever his Religion be who is to sit upon the Throne.

And for what concerns our Brethren of the *Roman Communion*, it is well known that we are not of those who *destroy* men for *Conscience* sake. We have never been infamous either for *Parisian Massacres*, or *Military Conversions*. They are Others that have ruined at once both the *Churches* and the *Servants of the Living God*, out of *Zeal* for their *Religion*. We have indeed taken care to remove the *Idols* out of our *Israel*; but for the *Worshippers* of them, if they have suffer'd any thing, it has not been for their *Idolatry*, but for that which shews there is *something else* more dangerous to the *English Monarchy* than this Charge.

The truth is, when I consider how heinous a *Suggestion* this is, and what little *foundation* there is, either from our *Principles*, or our *Practices*, to support it, I am under some temptation to reply to this Author, as an ancient *Father* once did to a *Heathen* who accused them of such *Cruelties* and *Filthiness* in their
Cere-

The PREFACE.

ix

Ceremonies, as none but themselves were capable of committing. ' *Nemo hoc PO-*

TEST CREDERE, nisi qui POSSIT Minor. Fe-
lix. Oct. p. 34.
AUDERE.

And this I hope may serve for my Excuse, if I have at this time appear'd in *defence* of a Charge in which every true *Member* of the Church of *England* is so highly concern'd; and for which all *Orders* and *Degrees* among us, have been so contemptuously exploded by this *Author*. Or if I must still be content to bear the Censure of such as He, I shall at least comfort my self in this, that I can fall under no *Reproach*, but what must at the same time reflect upon all the great *Names* of the *Primitive Christian Church*, with whom I had rather suffer the angry Reflections of a few of our own Communion, than flourish with them, and gain their Applauses.

To say the truth, when such Learned Defenders of our Church are struck at, and that in so impetuous a manner as that

C

most

THE PREFACE.

most deservedly esteemed Person he has so often mentioned, and I think never without something to raise his Repute amongst Honest and Judicious Men; I should be even ashamed not to be ill spoken of by such a one at the same time, if I had had the Honour of his Acquaintance.

Page 80.

As for what concerns the charge its self, I shall leave it to any one to judge, whether if the *Roman Church* be indeed guilty of what we say it is, we can discharge our Duty either towards God, or our Neighbour, as we ought to do, without endeavouring to convince them of their danger. And when others are so zealous for the Reputation of a few Men whose breath is in their Nostriks; sure we may be excused if we express some Jealousie for the Honour of that God who has made both them and us.

It is indeed a most deplorable Spectacle to consider whether *blind Superstition*, and a Zeal not according to *Understanding*, has been able to carry otherwise good and pious

THE PREFACE.

ous Men. Nor is it the least of my Wonders, to consider Persons whose Learning I admire, and whose Sincerity I am unwilling to question, yet either by the Prejudice of Education, or by some other Cause to me unknown, so byass'd in their Affections to the grossest Errors, that the most plain and convincing Arguments have not been able to prevail upon them.

'Tis hardly to be believed, but that they are themselves the *Publishers* of their own *Doings*, that in the clear Light of *Christianity* men should be so blind as to contend for giving *Religious Worship* to their Fellow *Creatures*, and set up senseless *Images* to be joyned in the very same Act of *Divine Adoration* with the great God the *Creator of Heaven and Earth*. And I would to God their Impiety had stopp'd here; but indeed it has gone much farther; they have found out ways how not only all other things, *Animate* and *Inanimate*, may be warrantably adored with *Divine Adoration*, but even the *Devil* himself be Worshipp'd, without sin; by virtue of a good *Intention*

Vasquez in
3 part. D.
Th. q. 23.
disp. 119.

to Honour God, and not certainly knowing it to be the *Devil*. And if we may believe a *Man* in his own *Case*, one of them once went much farther: He made no scruple to *Worship* the *Devil* whom he *knew* to be so, and that without taking any care (for ought appears by his *Relation*) to terminate his *Worship* finally upon *God*. And because it is indeed a singular instance, to shew to what *Extravagance* such *Principles* as we oppose, are apt to carry indiscreet *Votaries*, I will, to avoid all suspicion of falshood, give you a short account of it in his own words.

Recit Veritable de ce qui s'est fait & passé aux Exorcismes de plusieurs Religieuses de la Ville de Louiers en présence de Monsieur le Penitencier d'Evreux & de Monsieur le Gauffre.

1642. 30. 31.

Father *Gauffre* being sent for to *Exorcise* a terrible *Devil* call'd *Arfaxa*, which was got into the foot of Sister *Bonaventure* a *Nun*, she earnestly pray'd him that he would Confess her; for as the *Father* observes, the *Devil* had a particular desire to speak to him. After some Discourse had pass'd betwixt them, and they began to understand one another a little better, 'I threw

This Book was printed at *Paris*, Anno 1643. With Permission.

'my.

‘my self (says the Father) upon my
‘knees before him, telling him, that my
‘designe was to confound my *Pride* by that
‘of the *Devils*, and to learn *Humility* of
‘them that had none. The *Devil*, en-
‘ged to see me in that *posture*, told me,
‘that he had received a Command to pre-
‘vent me. But when I continued, for all
‘that, to *bumble* my self before him, he
‘thought to take advantage of it, and told
‘me, *Thou dost this to Adore Me*. I repli-
‘ed, Villain, thou art too infamous, I con-
‘sider thee as the Creature of my *God*, and
‘the Object of his *Wrath*; and therefore
‘I will submit my self to thee, though thou
‘dost not deserve it: and for that very
‘reason I will immediately *Kiss thy Feet*.
‘The *Devil* surprized at this Action, hin-
‘dred me. Upon which I conjured him
‘to tell me, as far as he could guess at
‘it, what the *Will* of *God* was, whether
‘that I should *Kiss his Feet*, or *He* mine?
‘He answer’d, Thou knowest what *Mo-*
‘tion *God* gives thee; follow that. Im-
‘mediately I threw my self upon the
‘Ground, and *Kissed his Feet*: at which
‘he

‘ he was in a Rage: And then I com-
 ‘ manded Him by the *Reliques* of *Faber Ber-*
 ‘ *nard*, to *Kiss* mine; which he did accord-
 ‘ ingly, with great readiness. After this, I
 ‘ continued upon my Knees before him, for
 ‘ about half a quarter of an hour.

And now when these things are publick-
 ly taught and done in the *Roman Church*, is it
 not high time for us to speak, and to assert
 the *Honour* of *God*, and the *Purity* of his
Religion? Shall others, without scruple,
 maintain and propagate their *Errours*, and
 shall it be a Crime in *Us*, even when at-
 tacked in the most violent manner, to de-
 fend the *Truth*? Nay, but let *God* be Ser-
 ved, though all the *World* be *Dissatis-*
fied.

In the mean time, whilst forced by these
 Considerations to assert our *Religion*, we
 pursue these *Examinations*, be it your parts
 (for whose sake we principally labour) to
 encourage our Endeavours by a firm ad-
 herence to that *Form of Sacred Doctrine*
 which you have received. As you have
 hitherto

THE PREFACE.

IX

hitherto maintained an Unreprovable Zeal
 for your Profession, to go on more and
 more to contend *Earnestly* for the Faith *Jude, v. 3.*
that was once deliver'd to the Saints. And
 above all, be careful to adorn your Holy
 Religion with a *suitable Practice*, *That 1 Pet. 3. 16.*
they may be ashamed, who falsely accuse
your good Conversation in Christ. For so
is the Will of God, that with well doing *Joh. 2. 15.*
ye should put to silence the ignorance of
foolish men. Let the same mind be in us,
 which was also in those Primitive Chri-
 tians before-mentioned. Let us boldly
 assert the Truth, as those who know what
 Account they are one day to give unto
 God for it; but let us also be *Charitable* *Mat. 5. 44.*
 towards our Neighbours: and if they will
 rather be esteem'd our Enemies, let us re-
 member, that even under that Name, we
 are yet to Love them. Let us still be care-
 ful to maintain the Character of the Best
 Subjects, as we have long asserted the most
 Loyal Principles: that as the Prosperity of
 our King makes up a considerable part of
 our Daily Prayers, so by a sincere discharge
 of all humble Obedience towards Him, He
 may

may be convinced of the Malice of those who would insinuate any false Suggestions against us ; and effectually see, that, excepting only our *Duty towards God*, we are much more Forward and Ready to do his Majesty Effectual Service, than any man can be, whose Loyalty is not Supported by Religion.

CHAP.

C H A P. I.

In which the Charge of Idolatry which we bring against those of the Church of Rome, is freed from those Odious Imputations that have been of late suggested against it.

IT may possibly appear to some not a little surprizing, that a Church which makes no scruple of *practising* what is *Idolatrous*, should yet be so very unwilling to lie under the *imputation* of it: There is nothing in all our *Disputes* with those of the *other Communion*, which they would be thought so highly to resent as this; the very mention of it has seem'd to *Scandalize* them; and if heat and confidence could have born us down, they had long since effectually deliver'd themselves from all *suspicion* of it.

It is not my business to enquire into the *Reasons* of this *Proceeding*, and which, when duly consider'd, will be found to have nothing in it, but what is exceeding natural. Men are always more forward to do ill things, than to *avow* them, or to own them under their proper names: *Idolatry* (as our Author says) is a *scandalous Charge*. By his leave, the *Charge* is not always

scandalous, though the Crime be ever so, and the Charge reputed scandalous by them who are charged with it. Though a *Church* that does countenance the Commission of it, may by subtile Arguments and bold Denials keep up its *Reputation* well enough amongst those who are resolv'd at any rate to believe her, yet 'twere impossible she should long support her *Interest*, should she freely avow the doing of it.

But of all the *Methods* that have been made use of to put a stop to this *Charge*, there has been none so surprizing as what this *Author* has here found out; and could he but have made it good, I am perswaded there would not have been any more effectual. He represents it as inconsistent not only with the *Principles of Charity* towards our *Neighbour*, but even of *Loyalty* towards our *Prince*; and makes the very mention of it to be little less than a *setting up of the Standard against Monarchy*. And yet he is not so unacquainted with the *Principles and Dispositions* of those of the Church of *England*, as not to know, that next to our sollicitude for the Honour of God, there are no two things in the World, we value our selves more upon, than that Character we have so justly obtained, of teaching the best Measures both of *Duty* to our *King*, and of *Love*, and *Kindness*, and *Charity* towards *One Another*.

I must therefore, before I proceed to vindicate our *Notion of Idolatry*, first say somewhat to remove this great *prejudice* that has been offer'd against it; And this I shall do,

- I. By considering upon what *weak Grounds* this *Author* has undertaken to insinuate these *Crimes* against us.
- II.

II. By shewing what *horrible Consequences* would follow from it, should what he pretends indeed be true.

I. Of the *weak Grounds* upon which he has undertaken to insinuate such things against us.

Now all that he has to say for this odious *Charge*, if taken out of his turbulent and declamatory *Stile*, is but this: "That *Idolatry* is a Sin very heighnous to God, *Page 71, 72*
"and which he therefore, under the *Law*, commanded
"to be punished with *Death*. This is the sum of what he has dilated upon in *three whole Pages*; and against this I have many things to except. For,

I. What if *Idolatry* be a damnable Sin, may we not therefore say, without uncharitableness, that those are guilty of it, whom we effectually prove to be so? *Must we therefore become mens Enemies because we tell them the Truth?* I am sure a very little *Charity* would have taught him to have made a better *Conclusion*; nor can I imagine what greater instance of my Affection, I could shew my best Friend, if I saw him in such a course as I thought would render him *eternally miserable*, than to tell him freely of the *danger* of his *Sin*; and press him with the best *Reasons* I had to perswade him to forsake it.

It may be he will say, he does not deny but that we may *charge* men with great *Sins*, provided that they be truly *guilty* of them: But yet that the heighnousness of this *Crime* should make us careful not to do it, but upon very good grounds; for to this purpose I find he sometimes expresses himself: "So black a
"Crime as this (says he) is not *Lightly* to be charg- *Page 73*
"ed on any Party of *Christians*. And again, "Be-

Page 73.

"fore so bloody an *Indictment* be preferred against the
 "greatest Party of *Chriftendom*, the nature of the thing
 "ought to be very well understood. And if this be all
 he means, we readily acknowledge the reasonableness of
 it: but then he ought not to fly out into such Tragical
 common places against us for charging the *Church* of
Rome with *Idolatry*; but to come close to the *Point*, and
 shew that we have not sufficient grounds for what we
 do. If those whom we accuse of this *Crime*, be indeed
 innocent of it, whether God had commanded *Idolaters* to
 be Stoned under the *Law* or not, we could not justify
 our charging of them with it: but if our *Arguments* do
 prove them guilty, the heinousness of the Sin, and the
 danger of it, may be a good motive to dispose them seri-
 ously to weigh our *Allegations*, but I am sure it can lay
 no obligation upon us not to impute to it them.

Page 70, 71.

Page 71.

2. As to the other *Insinuation*, that God command-
 ed *Idolaters* under the *Law* to be put to Death: And
 for proof of which, we have two long passages trans-
 cribed out of *Exodus* and *Deuteronomy*; What would
 he infer from it? would he prove to us, that therefore
 they ought to be put to Death by us under the Gospel
 too? does he look upon these *Precepts* as *Obligatory* to
 us now? If so, I dare be bold to say, he has done
 more in one single Page, to stir up the *People* against
 the *Romanists* and their *Images*, than all those popular
Divines he so complains of, in all the *Books* they have
 ever written upon this *Subject*. And yet this must be
 his *Meaning*, if it has any *Meaning* at all. For to exa-
 mine this matter a little more closely: God (he says)
 commanded the *Israelites* in *Deut. 13. 6. If thy bro-*
ther, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or
the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend which is as thine own
soul,

Page 72, 73.

soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, &c. Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him, neither shall thine eye pity him; But thou shalt surely kill him: thine hand shall be first upon him to death, and afterward the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones that he die. Now either he looks upon this *Precept* as still in force, and would hereby insinuate to the *People*, that it is their Duty, if they think the *Romanists* guilty of *Idolatry*, utterly to destroy them; and this is certainly one of the most *Seditious*, as well as one of the most *false* Suggestions in the World: or if he does not believe this *Command* obligatory to us now, nor would insinuate any such thing by the repetition of it, what *impertinence* must it be to say that we cannot in *Charity* charge the *Church of Rome* with *Idolatry*, because *God* commanded heretofore under the *Law* that all those that were guilty of it should be put to Death.

But though these kind of *Precepts* do not oblige us now, yet may not such a *Charge* be apt to stir up the deluded *Rabble* to think so; and so upon occasion encourage them to destroy the *Roman Catholics* and their *Images*, as the *Israelites* were commanded to destroy the *Canaanites* and their *Idols*? Answer, Yes; provided there were but a few such *Orators* as himself among them, to fill their heads with such *Notions* as these, and never tell them the *impertinence* of them. For instance: That these were onely the *Political Laws* of the *Jews*, and therefore can no more warrant us now to do any violence to our Neighbour, upon any such pretence, than because the *Jews* were commanded to do no work upon the *Sabbath day*, we may therefore lawfully Stone any one that we see gathering

Page 72.

Numb. 15. 32,
&c.

ing

ing a few Sticks upon it. But if the *Question* be, Whether the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, as it is managed by us against the *Church* of *Rome*, may not be apt to cause any such mischief? I say, it is not; and that for these Reasons: For,

r. Let him examin all our *Books* of *Controversie*, and see if he can find any of these old *Laws* produced, much less insisted upon, and enforced by us, to mislead the *People* into any such desperate *Mistakes*: On the contrary, we take all occasions to declare to them, that no pretences of this kind can warrant us so much as to withdraw our *Affection* from those who differ from us: That the *Jews* indeed esteem'd themselves allowed to hate their *Enemies*; that is, those who were not of the same Religion with themselves, but worshipped other Gods; and more especially those *Canaanites*, whom we are told it pleased God to destroy from off the face of the earth for their *Idolatry*: but that our Saviour Christ has utterly forbid us to make any such distinction: *I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you.* We set before them the Examples of the *Primitive Christians*; with what *Charity* they behaved themselves towards the *Gentiles* among whom they lived; with what an humble *Obedience* they submitted themselves to their *Idolatrous Emperours*, and underwent the most cruel *Persecutions* for their *Religion's* sake, even when they had power sufficient to have asserted their Faith, and to have destroyed both the *Idolaters* and their *Idols* together. And by these *Maxims* we exhort them to walk; and according to these it is that we both now do, and I am perswaded shall always behave ourselves with

Mat. 5. 43, &c.

Page 72.

Vers 44.

Tertul. Apol.

with all *Christian Charity* towards those of the *Roman Communion*, notwithstanding we both believe them to be guilty of *Idolatry*, and charge them accordingly. But

2. We do not only tell them, that those kind of *Laws* are now no longer in force, and that therefore we may not by vertue of them presume to run into any *violence* against our *Brethren*: but we teach them moreover, (what yet more shews the impertinent Malice of this *Suggestion*) that they never were intended, even under the *Jewish State*, to be in force against such *Idolaters* as they of the *Church of Rome* are. It is manifest to every one that has impartially considered the *Notion* of *Idolatry*, in the Old Testament, that there were two very different kinds of it: 1. One whereby they totally Apostatized from the *Law*, to Worship other *Gods* than the *GOD* of *Israel*; as when 'tis said that they fell off to Worship *strange Gods*; i. e. they renounced the Religion established by the *Law of Moses*, and took in another Religion, with all the *Ceremonies* and *Sacrifices* belonging to it, as the *Ægyptian*, *Canaanitish*, or *Chaldean*: And such as these were concluded under the Sentence of the *Law* before mentioned. 2. But then another sort of *Idolatry* there was, in which they still pretended to adhere to the *Law of Moses*, and Worship the *God* of *Israel*, but yet after an *Idolatrous* manner, as when *Jeroboam* set up the two *Calves* in *Dan* and *Beitbel*; parallel to which, is that *Idolatry* with which we charge those of the *other Communion* at this day. Now in this *Case*, though we find the *Prophets* severely exclaiming against their new *Altars*, yet we do not meet with any inforcement of this *Precept* for putting such *Idolaters* to Death, or that they are a-

ny where charged as guilty of it upon this Account.

In short, he that would know how innocent this Charge is, of any of those ill Consequences that are here brought against it, need onely look back to the State of the Church in the days of *Constantine*: there he will find our *Primitive Fathers*, freely accusing the *Arrians* of *Idolatry*, and sometimes warm enough too in their Disputes against them; but yet I believe all the Records of those times, will not furnish this Author with so much as one instance of any *Bishop* that ever put the Emperour in mind of this Law against them; or so much as insinuated to him, that he might warrantly destroy them out of his *Dominions* for their *Idolatry*. And sure our behaviour towards those of the Church of *Rome*, has not been so different from what theirs was against the *Arrians*, that any such violence should be fear'd from us now, as was never so much as urged by the hottest Opposers of *Idolatry* in those days.

But 2dly, If there be then no good Grounds for such Insinuations as these, which he has here offer'd onely to render our Charge of *Idolatry* odious, I am sure there is cause enough upon other accounts, to make them justly be detested by all good Men.

For 1. Not to say any thing of the sad Consequences that may arise from hence, should such insinuations as these ever be able to gain so much credit with his Sacred Majesty, as to make him entertain that ill Opinion of Us and our Religion, as we should justly deserve, were we such as we are here represented to be: Can any thing be more desperate, than to impeach at once the whole Body of a Great and Orthodox Church, of holding Principles so inhumane, "As to out do the very Cannibals themselves; and for which they have
"no

no other *Objections* than the *understand* *trish* *Ap*
 ferious of some *popular* *Distinction* than have no
 other measure of *Truth* or *Zeal*, but *Mixed* to
Popery. In short, of maintaining *Fanatick* *Professions*,
 and such as have ever been set up as the Standard a-
 gainst *Monarchy*. What is this but, in other words,
 to say, that all the *Orders* and *Degrees* of Men a-
 mongst us, that have ever been concern'd in charging
 the Church of *Rome* with *Idolatry*, our *Princes* and
 our *Nobles*, the Houses of *Parliament* and *Convocati-*
on, as many as concurred either to the *Approving* or
Subscribing the *Book of Homilies*, or to the *Establishing*
 or the obeying of the *Laws* made in the last *Reign*,
 not to say any thing of those *Learned Men* who have
 from time to time written expressly on this Subject,
 were all in plain terms neither better nor worse
 than a Pack of *Unlearned*, *Cruel*, *Barbarous*, *Cannibal*,
Fanatical, *Antimonarchical* *Fellows*.

Certainly, a man had need have either a very good
 Cause, or a very *hard* *Forehead*, that can have the con-
 fidence to pronounce such a Sentence as this, and of
 which I will only say, in his own words, 'That how
 inconsistent soever *Idolatry* may be with *Salvation*,
 'inconsistent soever *Idolatry* may be with *Salvation*,
 'I fear so *uncharitable* a *Calumny* can be of no less dam-
 'nable consequence. But however, *uncharitable* I *acknowledge*
 '2. To allow this great Author to take any *Liberty*
 he pleases with us: What shall we say as to the *Primi-*
tive Christians, whose Examples we follow, by whose
Principles we manage this whole *Controversy*, and with
 whom therefore we must either stand or fall. Were all
 they a parcel of *Seditious* *Fellows* too? It cannot be de-
 ny'd, but that those *Holy Men* very freely charged the
Gentiles first, and then the *Heretical Christians*, the *Ar-*
rians

rians, and others, with *Idolatry*. And the Passages of those Writers, *Justin Martyr*, *Origen*, *Clement Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Athanasius*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, and others, have been too often alledged, to need a Repetition here. And which ought not to be forgot, at the time that they did this, their Emperours were themselves of that very Religion which they so Accused. Now then, according to this *Learned Gentleman*, all these Holy *Bishops* and *Martyrs* were even as bad as we; and *Antiquity* has been so sottish as to celebrate the *Praises*, and recommend to us the *Examples* of a long Series of *Fatious Fanaticks*, who for their Rudeness to their Emperours, and *Cannibal* uncharitable *Censures* of their Brethren, justly deserv'd all the *Torments* and *Persecutions* that they underwent. But,

3. Because those that pretend the highest regard to the Authority of the Fathers, can yet easily except against it, when they are pressed with it, what will this Author say to that of the Apostles? It cannot reasonably be doubted but that *St. Paul* very well understood the true nature of *Charity*, who so often and earnestly recommended it to his Disciples; and that he was no Friend to any *Seditious*, *Anti-monarchical* Principles, I believe his 13th Chapter to the *Romans*, will sufficiently demonstrate. Yet behold this very *St. Paul* charging the Emperours Religion as *Idolatrous*, exhorting all men to forsake it as such; and going up and down in all parts, preaching where-ever he came against it, on this account. And I desire this Gentleman to consider with himself what he can say in defence of this *Holy Apostle*, that shall not vindicate us too.

[P. 3]

So that now then upon the whole it appears, that out of an over-eager desire to *Traduce* us, this *Judicious Author* has in his *Heat* exposed all the *Christians* of the first three hundred years, the *Catholicks* of the following *Centuries*, nay the blessed *Apostles* themselves, besides the whole *Body* of the *Reform'd Religion* in this and the last Age, as the worst of *Monsters*, and such as deserve to be esteem'd any thing, rather than *Christians*.

Let those, whose Cause he has so unfortunately undertaken, consider this; and I am perswaded they will begin to grow *asham'd* of their *Advocate*. And how unjust soever they may esteem our *Charge* of *Idolatry*, yet they will not say, it is such as cannot be maintain'd against them, without inspiring us at the same time with all the horrible impulses of *Cruelty* and *Barbarity* against themselves, and of *Faction* and *Rebellion* against the *Government*; which some men would insinuate.

As for our selves, we earnestly beseech all those of the *Church of Rome*, against whom we at any time advance this *Imputation*, that they will as *candidly* consider our *Arguments*, as we can truly profess they are *charitably* propos'd by Us; and whether they shall remain satisfied or not, that there is Reason in our *Charge*, yet to give us so much *Credit* with them at least, as to believe that we think there is; and shall be heartily glad to be convinced that we were mistaken in our *Opinion*.

CHAP. II.

In which this Author's True and only Notion of Idolatry is Consider'd, and the Method laid down for a more particular Examination of it.

Page 73. 74.

I Will now take it for granted, that under the shelter of so great an *Authority* as I have shewn to be equally concern'd with us, in all the scandalous imputations that can be rais'd against our charging those of the *Church of Rome* with *Idolatry*, I may venture to search a little more particularly into the nature of it, without being thought either a *Cannibal* or a *Fanatic*, or to have any design of *setting up a Standard against the Monarchy*, for my so doing; especially considering that I resolve not to encounter any *Church* or *Party* of men in the *World* on this occasion, but merely to shew that this *Man's Notion of Idolatry*, though set off with such assurance as few Writers have ever equalled, is yet, after all, so far from being supported either by *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, that it is indeed utterly repugnant to both. And therefore that the *Church of Rome* is only Vindicated by him from the Charge of an *Idolatry* that no man ever produced against her, but

but for such *Idolatry* as we accuse her of, she may still fall under the weight of that, for any thing that has here been offer'd to the contrary.

According to this Author, *Idolatry* is neither more nor less than this: *The Worship of the heavenly Bodies, the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, or any other Visible and Corporeal Deity, as the Supreme God, so as to exclude all Sense and Apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead.*

From whence it follows, that to make a Man an *Idolater*, these three things are required.

1. That he cast off all *Sense and Apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead.*
2. That he believes there is no other *Supreme God* than either the *Sun, Moon, or Stars, or some other the like Visible and Corporeal parts of the World.*
3. That in pursuance of this Apprehension, he worships these *Visible and Corporeal Deities* as the *Supreme God.*

Now to exclude all *Sense and Apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead*, and to believe no other *Supreme God*, but some *Visible and Corporeal* part of the *World*; in opposition to a *Spiritual and Invisible Godhead*, is, I think, to be an *Atheist*, though here is much ado to describe him. For to believe none but a *Visible God*, in opposition to an *Invisible One*, and to believe none but a *Corporeal God*, in opposition to a *Spiritual God*, is to believe no *God at all*; unless a man can suppose a *Supreme God*, without *Understanding*, or any *Perfection whatsoever of a Spiritual and Invisible Nature.*

By

By consequence, for a man with these Apprehensions to worship this God which he has made to himself, is not well capable of any other construction, than that he takes some pains, and goes a little way about to expose all *Religion and Worship* to Contempt.

I would be very glad to understand our *Author's* Notion of *Idolatry*; and therefore if it were possible, I should be content that his *Idolater* should not be an *Atheist* for a while, that we might see what else we can make of him. For a man to take nothing else for the *Supream God*, but a certain *Visible Being*, from which he shuts out all *Apprehension* of a *Spiritual and Invisible Godhead*, is certainly to be a downright *Atheist*, though his *Atheism* might have been described in fewer words. And yet on the other side, to worship something in good earnest as the *Supream God*, seems to imply that a man is not an *Atheist*. For an *Atheist* is one that does not so much as believe that there is a *Supream God*. But he surely *believes* a *God*, who worships any thing for the *Supream God*, whatever that be which he so worships.

Now if *Thomas Aquinas* were here, it would strangely perplex him to clear this matter. I do not mean to make good sense of the words, for that I take to be impossible, but to tell us by the words, what the *Author's* drift should be. For they make up a *Nonsense* so very stiff, that it will not bend one way or the other. And if I must understand something by every word that he says, I can have no more Notion of his *Idolatry* than I have of nothing. And if he had said, *Idolatry* is neither *more* nor *less* than *Nothing*, I had been as much edified as I am now. Unless he would give us to understand, that *Idolatry* is meer speculative

tive Madneſs, which no body that has common ſenſe and underſtanding, can poſſibly be guilty of.

For all that part of the World that either is or ought to be out of *Bethlehem* and the like *Hospitals*, do by the *Supream God*, underſtand ſomething at leaſt, that is not only able to help or to hinder, but knows alſo when to do one and t'other, and is willing to do accordingly. And therefore to worſhip any thing as the *Supream God*, and at the ſame time to exclude all *Senſe and Apprehenſion of a Spiritual and Inviſible Godhead*, is to worſhip a thing becauſe I am ſure it knows ſomething, while I take care to be as ſure at the ſame time, that it knows nothing at all. I can compare this to nothing, as I have already intimated, but to ſome extraordinary inſtance of *Madneſs*. For inſtance: If I ſhould ever ſee a man fall down upon his Knees, and ſeem in good earneſt to aſk Bleſſing of a Poſt, and to call it Father, I ſhould preſently think of this *Author's Idolater*: for his *Idolater* is rather more than leſs mad than he that fancies a *Poſt* to be his *Father*. For men in their Wits, have at leaſt as high an Opinion of what they take to be their *Supream God*, as they have of their *Parents*: And therefore to worſhip that as the *Supream God*, which no leſs wants the Perfections of a *Spiritual and Inviſible Nature*, than a *Poſt* does, is a Misfortune that cannot light upon any Body but a Mad man.

So that our *Author's Idolater* is a man whom either all the World muſt acknowledge to be out of his *Wits*, or if you put him into his *Wits*, he is a meer *Atheiſt*; though I am confident he would not have deſcribed himſelf ſo wittily, as this *Author* has deſcribed him.

This

This *Notion* of *Idolatry* is to me so manifest a *Notion*, that I am apt to look again and again into the Book, to see if the words be there in which he has deliver'd it. But when at last I find that they are undoubtedly there, I am taken with a new fear, that the *Author* did not mean what he says; and therefore that I do not understand his meaning, though I understand the meaning of his words.

In such a Case as this, I have nothing to do, but to take another *Notion* of *Idolatry*; which though it be not the true and only *Notion* of it, has yet plain sense, and comes as near to his, as a *Notion* that has sense can come to one that has none. And it is this: That *Idolatry* is the *Worship* of the *Sun*, *Moon*, or *Stars*, or any other *Visible* and *Corporeal* *Deity*, as the *Supream* *God*, not so as to exclude all *Sense* and *Apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *Invisible* *Godhead*; but so as we suppose that as they are *Visible* *Beings*, so they have *Invisible* *Natures* too, and some *Spiritual* *Perfections*, which are indeed proper to the true *God*.

Now this *Notion* of *Idolatry* is, in one part of it, quite contrary to our *Author's*. For they who worship any *Visible* *Deity* as the *Supream* *God*, with this persuasion, that it has indeed *Spiritual* and *Invisible* *Perfections*, do not thereby exclude all *Sense* and *Apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *Invisible* *Godhead*; because they have the *Sense* of such a *Godhead* in the *Notion* of that very thing which they worship. But though this is not the *Idolatry* which his Book speaks of, yet, as I said, 'tis the likeliest to it that I can think of. And if he does not mean what his Book says, 'tis a hinder'd to one but he means this.

But if I should be mistaken, 'tis no great matter; for

for if I can but shew that this is not the *only Notion* of *Idolatry*, it follows out of hand, that the *Notion* of his *Book* cannot possibly be so neither: So that one way or other I am sure to reach him, whether he and his *Book* have one meaning or two.

1. According to this *Notion* then, those who retain the *sense* and *apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *Invisible* Godhead, though they do worship the *Heavenly Bodies*, the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, but this only as *Inferior* and *Subordinate Deities*, cannot be *Idolaters*. And therefore if the *Gentiles*, the *Egyptians*, for instance, or the *Chaldeans*, did believe *One Supreme God*, and worshipped the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, upon the account of those *Celestial Spirits* they supposed to reside in them, this worship was not *Idolatrous*.

In like manner, those *Gentiles* that worshipped any *Corporeal Deity*, or any thing *Visible* or *Invisible* besides the *Supreme God*, if they believed all the while that it was not the *Supreme God*, and did not worship it as such, they I say could not be *Idolaters*. And therefore I think if the *Gentiles* were *Idolaters* in worshipping any of their *Deities*, it must be because they had no knowledge of the *true God*. So that either *St. Paul* or this *Author* was out in the *true* and *only Notion* of *Idolatry*. For though *St. Paul* accused the *Gentiles* of *Idolatry*, yet he confessed, that they *knew God*. For (says he) Though they knew *God* yet they glorified him not as *God*. *Rom. 1.*

2. If we do but interpret the *Cautions* of the *New Testament* against *Idolatry*, by our *Author's Notion* of *Idolatry*, they will be *Paraphrased* so as I believe they never were done before his time, and I suppose

will never be after it. For instance; When St. Paul said to the *Corinthian Christians*, *My dearly Beloved, flee from Idolatry*; this was as much as if he had said, *My dearly Beloved, Idolatry being neither more nor less than the Worship of the Heavenly Bodies, the Sun, the Moon, the Stars, or any Other Visible or Corporeal Deity as the Supreme God, I intreat and earnestly require you to Flee from Idolatry. And therefore though I do not bid you worship the Heavenly Bodies, or their Images upon Earth, yet I strictly charge you, not to worship them as the Supreme God, or as if there were not an Invisible God above them All; if ever you should find it convenient to worship the Sun or Moon, or Stars, or any Representation of them here below.*

This would be an Admirable Paraphrase, and which I doubt not but our Author would be able to make good against all those that *neither do, nor can, nor ought to understand* these things. But whether our Nobility and Men of Quality are willing to come into this Number I think I need not say.

3. But because to *Created Beings* he afterwards adds *Mortal Ones*, of which more hereafter, I suppose he means *Reasonable Beings*; let us see how things will go upon these *new Terms*. *Dearly Beloved*, if ever you should worship *Saturn* or *Jupiter*, or such like men who died long since, still remember that they were once *Visible* and *Mortal Men*, and have a care not to worship them as the *Supreme God*.

I mention here only dead *Ethiopians*, there being yet no *Christian Hero's* in St. Paul's time to whom any such worship was given, nor for some *Age* after.

after. Now I think this will pass as little as the Other with *Men* that *sight* and *do understand*. For besides the barbarous *Stuff* which this *Norian* makes the *Apostle* to speak, it presses a meer *Misunderstanding* upon us; That the *Apostle* supposes it utterly impossible for a *Christian* that does not at once renounce his whole *Faith* and *Profession*, to be guilty of *Idolatry*. St. Paul certainly was a very deep man in hiding his purpose, if by intreating the *Christians* to *Flee from Idolatry*, he meant no other thing than that they should not take and worship the *Sun*, or the *Moon*, or some dead man, as the *Supreme God*. And our *Author* is as deep a Man in finding out this hidden purpose of the *Apostle*, which till he arose no man was ever so happy as to do.

But indeed with all his *Rhetorick* he will never make himself and the *Apostle* of One mind in this matter. For thus St. Paul goes on: 'Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord and the Cup of Devils; Ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils. Do we provoke the Lord to Jealousie? Are we stronger than He?' Now if they who partake in *Idolatrous Sacrifices* are *Idolaters*, and if *Idolaters* have no Sense of a *Supreme God*, above the pretended *Deities* to whom they offer, they will not I conceive care one Far whether they partake of the *Lord's Table* or not, nor be concerned about the *Lord's Jealousie* at all. And yet St. Paul plainly supposes, that if *Christians* should be guilty of *Idolatry*, they would yet probably be concern'd about God's *Jealousie*, and desire to partake of the *Lord's Table*.

Thus when the same *Apostle* wrote to the very same Persons not to keep Company, no nor so much as to eat with One called a Brother, if he were a *Fornicator*, or *Covetous*, or an *IDOLATER*, or a *Railer*, or a *Drunkard*. I cannot but wonder what an *Idolater* has to do in this Company, if this *Author's Idolater*, and *St. Paul's Idolater* were the same *Idolater*. For whatsoever the *Fornicator*, or *Covetous*, or *Railer*, or *Drunkard*, might pretend for a Title to *Brotherhood*; I am yet certain, that he is fallen even from all right to that Name, who worships the *Sun* (for instance) as the *Supreme God*, and so renounces *God the Maker of the World*, and the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. *St. Paul* speaks of his *Idolater* as One within the *Church*, and One of those wicked Persons that were to be cast out of the *Civil* as well as the *Religious Communion* of it. But if there be no *Idolater* besides this *Author's Idolater*, who has renounced the *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, and lost all *Apprehension* of him, he has prevented the *Apostle's* direction, and is out of the *Church* by his own *Act*.

4. These things do, I confess, give me a great *Prejudice* against this *Author's true and only Notion of Idolatry*. And there is one thing which I believe will make him less fond of it himself, when he comes to consider it; and that is, that his *Notion* does by no means suit with the *Sense* of that *Church*, to which he designed a good Turn in all this. It is very well known how the *Fathers of Trent*, to Vindicate their *Worship of Images* from being *Parallel* to what the *Gentiles* heretofore paid to

to theirs, did, among other Differences, lay down this for one: *That they do not believe any Divinity or Virtue to be in them, for which they ought to be Worshipped.* For to believe this, their *Catechism* tells us, is to make the *Images* become *Idols*, and by consequence, the *Worship* of them to be *Idolatry*. Now if it be *Idolatry* to worship *Images* with such an *Opinion*, then it cannot be the *only Notion* of *Idolatry* to worship the *Sun*, *Moon*, or *Stars*, or any *Corporeal Deity*, as the *Supream God*, or their *Images* as the *Images* of a pretended *Supreme God*. For without any thing of all this, one may believe *Divinity* and *Virtue* to be in *Images*, and worship them upon that account.

For Example: The *Heathens* had a mighty *Opinion* of *Aesculapius* after his *Death*, that in his *Temples*, and by his *Images*, he could cure *Diseases*. Let us suppose now a *Person* to fall down and worship one of these *Images*, in hopes of some *Divine Virtue* coming thence. Were this *Worship* *Idolatry*, or not? If it were not, then was the *Council of Trent* to blame, to make this an instance of the *Gentiles Idolatry*; if it were, then in the opinion of the *Roman Church*, the account of *Idolatry* which this *Author* has given, cannot be the *only Notion* of it: For this was neither the *Worshipping* of any *Corporeal Deity*, as the *Supream God*, nor of any *Corporeal Image* of the *Supream God*.

Lastly, In all the *Accounts* which the *Missionaries* of the *Church of Rome* have given us of the *Heathen Nations* where they have come, we find them generally acknowledging a *Supream, Spiritual, and Invisible Godhead*. And that if they worship the *Sun*,
Moon,

Moon, or Stars, it is not that they esteem them to be meer Visible and Corporeal Deities, much less think them to be the *Supream God*, so as to exclude all sense and apprehension of a *Spiritual and Invisible God* above them; but they worship them either as inferior Deities, to whom God has committed the Government of the World under him; or they look upon God to be the *Soul of the World*, and that therefore the parts of it deserve Honour upon that account: or finally, they esteem God to be of so great Perfection and Excellency, that He is above their service, and that therefore they ought to pay their *External Adoration* to somewhat below him. Now I shall leave it to this Author to consider upon what grounds, according to his *True and Only Notion of Idolatry*, he will charge these men with this Guilt; or if out of his great Charity he shall think fit generously to acquit them of it, I will then send him to some of his Friends of the *Roman Communion* for better Instruction.

These and many other Reasons, that I might add, occur to me upon the very first view only, to make me suspect his Hypothesis. But now when I examine it more particularly, I find it yet more gross and unreasonable. The sum of what he offers for it, is an *Historical Deduction* of the State of Idolatry in the *Old Testament*; compar'd with the Accounts that are given of the Idolatry of the *Ancient*, especially the *Eastern Nations*, 'Who acknowledged no other Deities, but the Stars, among whom the Sun was Supream; in opposition to which false Principle, Rabbi Maimon says, God enacted the Law of Moses. And according to this Law, it appears,

pears, That Idolatry is giving the Worship of the *Supream God* to any *Created, Corporal, or Visible Deity*, or any thing that can be represented by an *Image*, which nothing but *Corporal Beings* can; and to suppose such a Being the *Supream Deity*, is the only *true and proper Idolatry*.

In opposition to which positive *Conclusion*, I will content my self at present to say, that there is not one word of truth in it; for that neither was the *Religion* of the *Eastern Nations*, such as he pretends, nor the *Nature of Idolatry* under the *Law*, what he represents it to have been. And to the end I may plainly clear this whole matter, I will distinctly shew three things.

First, That the *Idolatry* of those Nations whom he mentions, the *Egyptians, Chaldeans, Persians, Arabians*, &c. did not consist in Worshipping the *Sun, Moon, and Stars*, as the *Supream God*; So as to exclude all sense and apprehension of a *Spiritual and Invisibile Godhead*. Nor therefore,

Secondly, Was this the only *Idolatry* forbidden to the *Jews* by the *Law*. But

Thirdly, That as the *Jews* retaining both the apprehension and worship of the *God of Israel*, were yet guilty of *Idolatry* for worshipping him after a *gentile manner*, so may *Christians* be now.

And therefore that the *Church of Rome* may justly be charged by us as *Idolatrous*, though we do not pretend in any wise to say either that she worships the *Sun, Moon, and Stars*, or any other *Visible and Corporal Deity* as the *Supream God*; or that she has

lost all *Apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible God-head.*

And thus having established the *true Notion of Idolatry*, I shall last of all consider such *Objections* as may be necessary to be replied to for the clearing of it, and so leave the *particular Charges* to be made good by those who shall have occasion so to do.

CHAP.

CHAP. III

Of the Idolatry of the Ancient Heathens; especially, of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Persians; and that it did not consist in their Worshipping the Sun, Moon and Stars, or any other Visible and Corporeal Deity, as the Supreme God; so as to exclude all Sense and Apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead.

THis is the *Fundamental mistake* of our Author concerning his *Notion of Idolatry*; and which being overthrown, his whole *Hypothesis* built upon it, must fall together with it. For thus it is that he argues: 'God designed by his *Law*, to preserve the Jews from falling into the Idolatry of the Nations round about them: Against this, we find not only all its *Precepts*, but even the *Rights* and *Ceremonies* of it, to have been directed. But the *Idolatry* of those Nations was no other than the *Worship* of the *Sun, Moon* and *Stars*, or of some the like *Visible* and *Corporeal Deities*, so as to exclude all *Sense* and *Apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *Invisible Godhead*. And therefore this must be the *true* and *only* *Notion* of it in the *Old Testament*.

P. 86;
P. 102.
P. 97, 100.

G

I shall

I shall hereafter more fully shew the weakness of this *Proof*, when I come to demonstrate, That there were two sorts of *Idolatry* mention'd in those *Holy Scriptures* extreamly different the one from the other. And therefore that tho this were the *true* Notion of *Idolatry* in one respect, yet it would not follow that it was the *only* Notion, by reason of the other. And this I shall do in the *next Chapter*. My business at present is to shew, That what he has thus Confidently laid down, is so far from being the *only* Notion of *Idolatry*, that it is indeed no *Notion* of it at all; for that those very *Heathens* whom he insists upon for his Warrant in this matter, were not guilty of such an *Idolatry* as he pretends they were.

P. 74.

Ibid.

P. 99.

P. 100.

Ibid.

We have already seen his *Definition* of *Idolatry*, that it is neither more nor less than this: 'The Worship of the Heavenly Bodies, the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, or any other Visible and Corporeal Deity, as the Supreme God, so as to exclude all Sense and Apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead. This he pretends is the only Scripture Notion of it. And thus (he says) all Learned Men of all Nations, all Religions, ever understood the old Notion of *Idolatry*, till this last Age, when Folly and Passion cast it at any thing that peevish Men were angry with. So Rabbi Maimon, the most Learned and Judicious of the Jewish Doctors Discourses at large, That the Ancient *Idolatry* was nothing but the Religion of the Eastern Nations, who acknowledg no other Deities but the Stars, among whom the Sun was Supreme. And then he immediately subjoyns, That the Ancient *Heathens* worshipped only the Stars, without any Notion of Heroes or Demons: So Diodorus Siculus says of the
*
Egypti-

Egyptians; Herodotus of the Persians and Chaldeans; Strabo and Justin, of the Arabians, and Caesar of the Germans. He confesses indeed, That there was another sort of *Idolatry* introduced afterward, the *Worship of Men and Women*; but this he takes to have been much more *Modern, and a meer Invention of the vain and lying-Greeks*; but that whensoever it came in, it was grafted upon the old Stock, of giving the *Worship of the Supreme God, not only to created, but to mortal Beings.* So this Author. To which I Reply.

I. That as to this latter sort of *Idolatry*, seeing he has declin'd the Consideration of it, as being of too young a date to found the *Scripture Notion of Idolatry* upon it, I shall not insist upon it; tho I am by no means satisfied, either in his account of its *Antiquity*, or that it was a *meer Invention of the vain and lying Greeks.* For

1. It has been the Opinion of very Learned Men, that this kind of *Idolatry* was practis'd in *Egypt* soon after the Flood. And that the most Ancient *Osiris*, was no other than *Mitrazim*, the Son of *Cham*, whom they worshipp'd together with his Father, and from whom the whole Country is in *Scripture* called by his Name. In the cv. *Psalms* 23. it is expressly stiled, the *Land of Cham*: And *Plutarch* informs us, that in the Sacred Rites of *Isis*, they call it *Χημια*, very probably upon the same Account. And that which makes this the more likely is, that in the Division of the World among the Sons of *Noah*, Gen. x. *Arabia* fell to the Lot of *Cham*; and in that *Chus* his eldest Son fix'd himself, from whence the Country is called, the *Land*

See Vossius de
Idol. l. i. c. 27.

Plutarch de
Iside & Osiri:
de.

of *Cush*; in 2 *Kings* xix. 9. And then it may easily be conceiv'd that his second Son *Mitiraim*, should go into the next adjoining Country, the Land of *Egypt*. Now if this be so, then it follows, not only that this sort of *Idolatry* was much more Ancient than is pretended; but that being practis'd in *Egypt* before the Children of *Israel*'s going down thither; it may be reasonably enough allow'd a sufficient Antiquity for us to derive something from it of the *Notion* of *Idolatry*, with reference to the times under debate. But, 2dly, As to the very *Apis* its self, the chief Deity of the *Egyptians*, and whom our *Author* contends to have been the *Sun*; it is not improbable, but that they meant no other than the Patriarch *Joseph* by it; and whom they Honour'd with *Divine Honours*, upon the Account of his wonderful Preservation of them in the seven years *Famine*, Gen. xli. Thus *Julius Firmicus* expressly Interprets it, and what is more, adds, that this was according to the manner of their Country: 'The *Egyptians* (says he) after his Death, according to the appointment of their Country, built Temples to Him. And again, This Man is worshipt in *Egypt*, he is adored, &c. To him *Ruffinus* agrees; and *St. Augustin*, or whoever else was the Author of that Book under his Name, *De Mirabilibus Scripturæ*, informs us, 'That the *Egyptians* upon this account, set up the Symbol of an Ox over the Sepulchre of *Joseph*, in Memory of their Deliverance. Thus *Suidas* interprets their *Serapis*; who as *Clemens Alexandrinus* (out of *Aristeas*) tells us, was the same with *Apis*; and both *Suidas*, *Ruffinus*, and *Julius Firmicus*, add, that his Statue was set up with a *Bushel* upon his Head, to denote the *Plenty of Corn* which he provided for them.

†

And

P. 89.

Jul. Firm. p. 17,
18.Ruffin. l. 2.
Hist. Eccles. c.
23.Suidas in voce
Serapis. Cl.
Alex. Cræm.
1.

And in the very Scripture it self, *Joseph* is either call'd, or at least compar'd to an *Ox*; Deut. xxxiii. 17. And some of the *Rabbins* have given this account of the very *Calves* of *Jeroboam*, that they were the Symbols of *Joseph*, set up by him in Honour of his Ancestors, from a part of whose *Tribe*, viz. that of *Ephraim*, he was himself descended.

Here it were an easie matter to multiply Proofs upon this occasion, to shew that the *Idolatri* of Consecrating *Heroes* into Gods, and Worshipping them as such, is by no means of so fresh a date, as this *Author* would have it thought to be. For what he adds, *That when-
soever it came in, it was grafted upon the Old Stock of
giving the Worship of the Supreme God, not only to
Created, but to Mortal Beings:*

Page 101.

Answer, 1. That this is evidently contrary to all the accounts we have of their Worship; and according to which it appears, that the *Heathens* paid no other Worship to their *Divi*, or *deified Men*, than what the Church of *Rome* at this day does to her *Saints*; but as carefully distinguish'd between the Adoration of the *Supreme God*, and these *Heroes*, as the other do between *Him*, and those *Blessed Men* that *Reign together with Him*, as their Language tells us.

2. Whenever this *Idolatri* came in, 'tis evident that the very nature of it utterly overthrows his *Only Notion* of *Idolatri* before laid down; unless he supposes that they thought their *Heroes*, whom whilst they lived they knew to be but *men*, born into the World after the common order of Nature, and even dying after the same manner as all others, became after Death the *Supreme God* that made *Heaven* and *Earth*; and believed all this so firmly, as not only to give the *Wor-*
ship

ship of the *Supreme God* to them, but to exclude all *Sense* and *Apprehension* of any *God* above them. For so (*he says*) a man must do, before he can be guilty of *Idolatry*.

Now if this be his Opinion, I would then ask this *Learned Antiquary* one small *Question*: Seeing the Number of their *Heroes* was very great, whom the same Persons at the same time worshipped; Did they believe every one of these to be the *Supreme God* that made *Heaven* and *Earth*, and give the highest *Divine Honour* accordingly unto every one of them as such? That they did this, no man of *Sense* will either say or believe; and yet if they did not, the *true* and *only Notion* of *Idolatry* is at an end; for which ever of their *Heroes* they believed to be the *Supreme God*, and *Worshipped* as such, they must have *Adored* the rest only as *Inferior Deities*, and with an *Honour* suitable to their *Apprehensions* of them.

Page 74. Either therefore he must quit his *true* and *only Notion* of *Idolatry*, which he tells us is *neither more nor less* than, 'The *Worship* of the *Heavenly Bodies*, the *Sun*, the *Moon*, and the *Stars*, or any other *Visible* and *Corporeal Deity*, as the *Supreme God*, so as to exclude all *Sense* and *Apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *invisible Godhead*; or he must give us some assurance that the *Egyptians* (for instance) worshipping of *Joseph* under the *Symbol* of an *Ox*, did believe him to be the *Supreme Deity*, so as to exclude all *sense* and *apprehension* of any *Superior Godhead*, and did worship him accordingly; that is, that those men were so foolish as to think that a man who had *lived* and *died* amongst them, was the *Great God* that framed the world, and all things in it, many *Ages* before himself had any *Being*. But

II. To

II. To come to the *Other*, and (as he supposes) the more Ancient *Idolatry*, and in his Notion of which, I affirm him to have been utterly mistaken: And here I must observe, that it is not at all doubted, but that these *Heathens* did Worship the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*; that which I pretend is, that this *Author* is very much out in the Account which he gives of their *Worship* of them.

1. He affirms, That they worshipp'd these *Heavenly Bodies* as *Visible* and *Corporeal Deities*, so as to exclude all *sense* and *apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *Invisible Godhead*: Whereas on the contrary, they believed these *very Bodies themselves* to be animated by *Celestial Spirits* who resided in them, and rendred them thereby proper *Objects* of their Adoration. Page 74.

2. That they worshipp'd these *Visible* and *Corporeal* *Deities*, as the *Supreme God*; whereas they constantly acknowledged a *First* and *Invisible Godhead*, *superior* to them. Ibid.

3. That they worshipp'd no *other Gods* but these, Page 97, 100. and amongst these the *Sun* as *supreme*; when on the contrary it is certain, even from the very *Authors* that himself produces, that they worshipp'd *other Deities*, both *Heroes* and *Demons*, of which this Man yet pretends with so much assurance, that *they had no Notion*.

And all these are not only *gross Errors* for an *Author* who writes with such Confidence as if he would be thought to have been *initiated* into all the *Religions* of which he discourses, but such as utterly ruin all that he has to say to support his true and only Notion of *Idolatry*. But I must examine these Points more particularly. And

I. 'That

i. 'That these Nations did not worship the *Heavenly Bodies* as *Visible* and *Corporeal Deities*, so as to exclude all *sense* and *apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *invisible Godhead*.

This is an Assertion not only so monstrously absurd in its self, but so contrary to all the Accounts we have from *Antiquity*, of the *Theology* of those Nations to which he refers us, that I must once more confess, that I never lay under a greater Temptation to disbelieve my own *Senses*, or to suspect my understanding of plain words than now : On the one hand, I am sure our *Author* here defines *Idolatry* to be, 'The Worship of the *Heavenly Bodies*, the *Sun*, the *Moon*, and the *Stars*, or some other visible and *Corporeal Deity*, not only as the *Supreme God*, but so as to exclude all *sense* and *apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *invisible Godhead* : That is to say, that he who is an *Idolater* must worship them as mere *Corporeal Parts* of the *Creation*, void of all *Understanding* ; for so I think *Visible* and *Corporeal Gods* must be taken, when opposed to all *sense* and *apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *invisible Godhead*. And yet on the other hand, how to reconcile such a *Paradox* with either the *common Reason* of *Mankind*, as I have observed before ; or the clear *Evidences* of the *Gentile World* to the contrary, as I observe now, I am not able to comprehend : But let our *Author* take his choice ; for I will here again do more than I need, rather than be thought to omit any thing that was fit to be taken notice of. If he thinks good to own this *Notion*, I will then offer what may serve to confute it ; but if being admonished of the *Absurdity* of it, he shall chuse rather to wrest his words to some other meaning than they naturally bear, I shall

shall only have spent some little time in *confuting* that; which if he does not, I am certain no body else will ever *affirm*.

And to begin where himself does, with the *Holy Scriptures*, not only the most certain, but the most *Ancient History* in the *World*.

He produces indeed a few Texts from whence it may be concluded, that the *Heathens* of old, did worship the *Sun, Moon, and Stars*; but that they worshipped them (according to his Notion) as *Corporeal Deities*, and so as to *exclude all sense and apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead*; for this he has not so much as offer'd at one single Proof.

For 1. As to his first Instance, (and which indeed Page 77. is the first account we have) of *Idolatry*. The Scripture, 'tis true, tells us that *Terah, Abraham's Father*, worshipped *Strange Gods*; but that these *Gods* were *Corporeal Deities*, and that they worshipp'd them so as to *exclude all sense and apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead*, of this there is not a word: See *Josh. xxiv. 2.* and I shall presently shew the contrary.

If we go on with him to the next (and as he thinks Page 78. the first plain) intimation we find of *Idolatry* in *Palastine*, 'in the History of *Jacob*; after his Conversation with the *Shechemites*, where upon his departure *Gen. 35.* 'from that City by God's especial Command, he builds 'an Altar at *Bethel* to *God*, and commands his Family 'to put away their *Idolatry*, or *strange Gods*. Neither here shall we find our *Author's* notion so much as insinuated, but as I will now prove, much to the contrary. It is not to be doubted, but that these *Gods* were the same that they worshipped in *Syria* when they

H

were

were in the house of *Laban*; and that therefore the Images which *Jacob* buried, could be no other than the *Teraphim*, so usual amongst them, *i. e.* such as *Rachel* stole from her Father *Laban*, Gen. xxxi. 30. How far from hence it might be proved that their *Idolatry* did not consist merely in their worshipping of the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, I shall not now dispute: Let us suppose these *Teraphims* to have been not only made by *Planetary Influences*, but designed to represent the *Sun*, or some other *Heavenly Bodies*; then, I say, it follows both from the History of *Laban*, and from the accounts we have of these *Idols*, that they did not worship the *Sun* as a *Corporeal Deity*, and by consequence that that cannot be the true Notion of their *Idolatry*, which is pretended to be. For,

1. As to *Laban*, we read Gen. xxxi. 53. that when he ratified the Covenant with *Jacob*, he called to witness not only the *God of Abraham*, but the *God of his own domestick Deity* too, *i. e.* in our Author's opinion, the *Sun*, 'The God (says he) of Abraham, and the God of Nachor judg betwixt us: Now this plainly shews that *Laban* lookt upon his Father's God (and who was also the God of *Tera* before-mentioned, *Josh.* xxiv. 2.) not to be a mere *Corporeal Deity*, but as having an *Intellectual Being* incorporated in it, that was both capable of hearing their *Oath*, and of judging betwixt them, and without which he could never have called him to witness their Contract.

2. For what concerns the *Teraphim*, it appears from Holy Scripture, that the *Chaldeans* made use of them not only as *symbols* for Worship, but for *Oracles* too, and as such, were wont to consult them; it was for this, that *Rachel* is supposed to have stolen away her
Fa-

Father's Gods, Gen. 31. that so when he should come, and miss her husband, he might not be able to enquire of them which way to pursue after him. We read in Ezek. xxi. 21. *That the King of Babylon consulted with his Teraphim*, which St. Jerome calls consulting with his Oracle, after the manner of his Country: And the Prophet Zachary x. 2. tells the People, *That their Teraphim had spoken vanity*: Now how could this possibly be, had the Chaldeans worshipped only Visible and Corporeal Deities? Is not this an undeniable Evidence, that they acknowledged in the Heavenly Bodies, invisible Spirits to descend and influence their Teraphim, so as to make them speak?

Many are the accounts that may be given of these Idols, and which have been collected with much exactness by those great men, Gerard Vossius, Mr. Selden, &c. But I shall content my self to subjoin the Authority of one only Person, now living, and no way inferior to any that can be produced, *It seems (saith he) to have been the Opinion of those Ancient Idolaters, that some spiritualities from superior Intelligences, and Heavenly Powers, did influence such Images as they made in such Figures as they thought acceptable to them, and dedicated to them; and therefore called such their Images themselves God, and thought them so, at least Deos Vicarios, Inferior Deities; Mediators between them and the Superior, and did offer Sacrifice, and burnt Incense, that they might draw down and entice (as it were) those spiritual Influences to reside on those Images, that so they might declare to them, and do for them what they desired.* And elsewhere he says, *That the modern Zabbii not only pretend to succeed the old Chaldees in their Religion, but that as to their Rites about Telestms, and Figures,*

Hierom in l. 7.
in Ezek. p. 212.

Vossius de I.
dol. lib. 1.
Selden de diis
Syris Syntag.
l. c. 2.
Dr. Pocock on
Hofea xlii. 2.
p. 723.

Id. on Hofea
iii. 4.

'Figures, and Images, we cannot but easily believe, that they were derived to them from Ancient Times.

Page 76.

Pag. 110, 111.

And now that I mention the *Zabii*, I cannot but observe the wonderful acuteness of our Author in his Reflections upon them; he calls it *'the Dream of the Zabii*; and he decretorily condemns all that is said by Learned Men on their behalf, merely because *'He (a Person so accurately versed in all the Learning of the East) can find no Ancient Footsteps of any such people in the world*; and that Dr. Spencer has discover'd for him, *'That the name is no older than Mahomet, who call'd them Zabii, because they lay Eastward from Arabia*; for so the word signifies, *Easterlings*.

De Legib. Heb.
1. 2. c. 1. Sect. 1.

Thus this Author, and still, as becomes himself, he pronounces, *Dictator-like*, and is always in the wrong; for the Question is not about the name of *Zabii* (which from henceforth must signify *Easterlings*, tho the Learned Dr. Spencer had collected no less than *five several significations* of it, and every one supported by probable *Conjectures*); but about the *People*, or rather the *Religion*; and to draw this matter out of the *Clouds*, and shew what an Admirable *Critick* we have got here, it is just as if a man should undertake to prove the *Britains* to be a people of no *Antiquity*, because they are now called *Welch*, and that's but a *Modern Name*.

Spencer ib. 1.
2. c. 1. Sect. 2.

Dr. Spencer
ib. p. 240.

Now according to this true State of this Matter, it is evidently shew'd by that *Learned Person* I before mentioned, that the Religion of the *Zabii* is not only of no Modern date, but is as Ancient, or even more Ancient than *Abraham*. *Abulfeda* calls it the *most Ancient Religion*; and *Saidus Batricides* attributes the Original of the *Zabii*, thus consider'd, in their *Manners*,

ners and Superstitions, to the time of *Nachor, Abraham's* De Convers. Indor. l. i. c. 4.
 Grandfather. To this Subscribes the Learned and In-
 quisitive *Hornbeck*; and who thinks them to be the
 same with those that were anciently called *Sabæi*;
 and *Abul-Pharajius*, cited by *Dr. Spencer*, thus con-
 firms it, 'That which we certainly know of the Sect of the
 'Zabii, is, that their Profession is altogether the same with
 'the Profession of the Ancient Chaldeans. Hist. Dynast. D. 9. p. 181.

As for the point before us; we are told that they Spencer ib. p. 237, 238.
 worshipped the *Host of Heaven*, supposing the Stars
 to be animated by *Divine Understandings*. *Dr. Po-*
cock adds, 'That they lookt upon the Planets, as Me- Not. in spec. Hist. Arab. p. 143.
 diators between the Supreme God, and Men; and cites
 'Gregorius, *Abulfaræus* and *Sharestanius*, for his War-
 'rant; which last expressly says, That they worship
 'the Bodies of the Planets, as the Habitations of the
 'living, rational, and intellectual Substances, which they
 'suppose to animate them. Ibid. p. 146.

Now these are all plain and rational Accounts,
 why they should worship these *Heavenly Bodies*; but
 to talk of their worshipping the *Sun, Moon and Stars*,
 as *Visible and Corporeal Deities*, and that so as to ex-
 clude all *Sense and Apprehension* of a *Spiritual and*
Invisible Godhead, is to represent their Worship con-
 trary not only to *Truth*, but to *common Sense and*
Reason too. But when Men are resolved to advance
 such Notions, as this *Author* does, they must have
Proofs of the same kind. And this for the *Chalde-*
ans.

As to the *Egyptians*, *Jamblicus* informs us, That Jamblic. de Myster. Sect. 37.
 they worshipped indeed the *Sun, Moon and Stars*, as
Visible Gods; but such as were compounded of *Soul*
 and *Body*, and they esteem'd those Planets to be *Seats*
 only

only of those *Cælestial Spirits* that were to take care of human Affairs.

Id. Sect. 1. c.
17.

It was a nice Question put by *Porphyry*, to an *Egyptian Priest*, 'How the Sun, Moon and Stars could be Gods, seeing the Gods are incorporeal?

Jamblicus answers, 'That the incorporeal Gods assume those Bodies, by which they become Visible. And *Syrianus* asserts, The *Cælestial Animals* (as he calls them) 'to be the Images of the Maker of the World, 'and to communicate Sense to it.

But it may be said, That these were *Philosophers*, and endeavour'd to make the best of their *Idolatry*. I answer, That *Jamblicus* declares, he delivers nothing but according to the old *Egyptian Books*: And he delivers it for the true *Egyptian Theology*; That there was

Cap. 2.

one Supreme God above all; next him the *Demiurgus*; the third Principle he calls *Barians*, and some think the *Sun* is meant by it, as the immediate Governor of the World. If so, there is great Reason why the *Sun* should be worshipped under the Names of *Moloch* and *Baal*, as being King and Lord of this inferior World. And thus neither did the *Egyptians* worship these Heavenly Bodies, so as to exclude all Sense of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead.

Gol. not. in
Alferg. p. 20,
21.

If from both these Nations we pass finally to the *Perfians*; *Jac. Golius* will give us the very same Account of them, viz. That the Ancient *Perfians* did worship *Cælestial Spirits*, as having a particular presidency over the material part of the World.

And now, after so many plain Testimonies in this matter, were it yet needful to look into any other Countries, we should find the Case to be every where the same. *Pliny* pleads much for the Divinity of the Sun;

Pliny l. 2. c. 6.

Sun; but do's he believe it to be a *Visible* and *Corporeal* Deity, so as to exclude any *Invisible* and *Spiritual* Godhead? No, on the contrary, he calls it the *Spirit* and *Mind of the World*. He attributes Sense and Understanding to it; and affirms from *Homer*, That it sees and hears all. And indeed this is so often insisted upon by that *Poet*, that *Eustathius* from thence observes, that the *Sun* was to be consider'd not only as a *Luminary* of the *Heavens*, but as a *Coporeal* *Admirer*, a *Spirit* clothed with such an illustrious Body. And in another place he takes notice of the decency of *Homer*, That he calls the heavenly Powers to be Witnesses of Oaths, and particularly the *Sun*.

Eustath. in
Homer, Odyss.
T. p. 1871.
In Iliad. T. p.
414.

Ζῆν Πάτερ ———— κρόνον, μέγαρα,

Ἡέρας δ' ἐς πατρὶς ἱερῶν, καὶ πατρὶς ἑκάστων,

Ἐπεὶ μέγαρα ἴσα, γυμνάσσει δ' ἵππον ἀνδρῶν.

So little Truth is there in this first of our Authors Pretence, 'That the Ancients did Worship the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, as Visible and Coporeal Deities, so as to exclude all Sense and Apprehension of a Spiritual and Invisible Godhead. Let us see

2dly, Whether they who worshipp'd these *Planets*, look'd upon them as the *Supreme Deities*, so as not to acknowledg any Divinity above them.

And here it must be confess'd, he has at least an appearance of Truth. For, as for the *Chaldeans*, *Maimonides* tells us of the Ancient *Zabii*, That they had no other Gods but the Stars; and that among them, they

Mor. Nevoch.
l. 3. c. 29.

Hornbeck de
Convers. Ind.
l. 1. c. 4.
Pocock Not.
in Spec. Hist.
Ar. p. 139.

they look'd upon the *Sun* as Supreme. From whence our Learned *Pocock* seems to think it not far from the Truth, to say, that possibly they derived their very Name of *Zabii*; *Saba* in the *Hebrew*, signifying an Host, as if one should say, עֲבַדֵּי הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ, Worshippers of the Host of Heaven.

The same is the Account which *Sanctioniathon*, mentioned both by *Eusebius* and *St. Cyril*, gives of the *Phœnicians*, 'That they worshipped the Sun, Moon and Stars, as the only immortal Gods, among which the Sun was chief, called by them *Beth-Samen*, Lord of Heaven. And for the *Persians*, *Herodotus* tells us, That the *Sun* was their only God; ἡλίου ὁ μόνος θεὸς Ἰνδῶν, to which *Strabo* and *Trogus*, in *Justin*, assent. And *Hesychius*, tho he rejects this, yet acknowledges him to be the first or supreme God amongst them μῆνός (says he) ὁ πρῶτος καὶ μέγας θεός. All which seems to be confirm'd by those Ancient Inscriptions collected by *Gruterus* and others,

Apud Voss. loc.
cit. vid. Hornb.
de Con. Ind. p.
19. Elmenhorst
in Arnob. p. 27, &c.

DEO SOLI INVICTO. OMNIPOTENTI DEO.
And again, SOLI INVICTO & LUNÆ ÆTERNÆ.

P. 97.

from all which it may be thought to follow, that (as this *Author* here tells us) the Gods which those Ancient *Heathens* worshipped, were nothing but the Heavenly Bodies, or the *Sun* as the supreme Deity.

But yet if we enquire more exactly into these things, we shall find their Worship to have been much otherwise than what at first sight it appears to be; for to begin with those I last named, the *Persians*; and then whom none have been more famed for Adoring the

De *Iside* & *Sun*: *Plutarch* tells us that they had a Notion of a
Osiride. Deity

Deity whom they call'd *Oromasdes*, superior to him, and the Account of whom (derived to them from *Zoroaster*) he thus delivers to us. They believed that there were two contrary *Principles*, the one *Good*, the other *Evil*. The former of these they called *Oromasdes*, whom they also look'd upon as the *Διουππύς*, or *Creator*, as *Agathias* informs us; the other *Arimanius*. Between these two, they placed their *Mithras*, or the *Sun*, who was esteem'd by them, as much inferior to *Oromasdes*, as Superior to *Arimanius*. To this *Oromasdes*, they ascribed the Creation of the *Stars*, and of the *Good Gods*, thus *Plutarch*: But *Photius* carries it yet a little further in his Account of a Book written by *Theodorus*, Bishop of *Movestia*, concerning the *Persian Rites*, he says, That they believed the first Principle of all, to be *Zaradē*, and that he begat the other two, which with some little difference, he calls *Ormisdas* and *Satan*. Photius Cod. 81.

But not to insist upon these Accounts: We are told by a Learned Man in his Notes upon *Alferganus*, that the *Persians* gave the Names of their *Gods* to their *Months* and *Days*, according to the Ancient Religion of the *Persians* and *Magi*, whereby they did believe their *Gods* to preside over them; it being a Principle amongst them, as well as among all other *Nations* of the *East*, that the things of this lower World are administr'd by *Angels*. The Spirit over the *Sun*, they called *Mihragian*, from *Mitro* the *Sun*. But above all those, they believed there was one *Supreme God*. Jac. Golius Not. in Alferg. p. 20.

Eubulus, who wrote the History of *Mithras* (which was extant in *St. Jeromes* time) hath given a particular Account of the Cave which *Zoroaster* made in honour of another and superior *Mithras*, the Father and Maker Porphyr. de antro Nympharum.

Herod. Clio n.
131. p. 56.

Strabo l. 15.
p. 503.

See Dr. Cud-
worth. l. i. c. 4.

See Dr. Still.
Answ. to T. G.
p. 110.

of the World. Even *Herodotus* himself, whom this Author so confidently produces for his Warrant (but cites no particular passage of him) distinguishes their *Jupiter* from the *Sun*, and says, by it they understood the whole Heaven in which the *Sun* is fixt; and sacrificed to him distinctly from the other. And so does *Strabo*, another of his Authors: *Xenophon* often mentions a Ζεύς ὑπερθεῖς, as a Deity superior to the *Sun*; especially, where speaking of *Cyrus* being admonished in a Dream of his approaching Death, he tell us, that he sacrificed to his Country *Jupiter* first, and then to the *Sun*: And *Plutarch* brings in *Darius* in like manner addressing to him, Ζεύς ὑπερθεῖς Πατριῶν. Thou our Country *Jupiter*, or Supreme God of the Persians.

I might add here, That the same is the Opinion of those *Persees*, who stick to their Ancient Religion at this day. But these have been already collected by a very Eminent Hand. I shall conclude, therefore, with the form of that *Proclamation*, which *Cyrus* gave in favour of the *Jews*, and by which it plainly appears that they believed the same First and Sovereign Deity with our selves, *Ezra* i. 2. Thus saith *Cyrus King of Persia*, The Lord God of Heaven hath given me all Kingdoms of the Earth, and hath charged me to build him a House at Jerusalem. And in the next Verse, he calls the same God, The Lord God of Israel. And I hope this Author will not say that was the *Sun*, or any other Visible and Corporeal Deity.

I have enlarged my self the more on this part of Antiquity, because the *Persians*, if any, must have been found to worship the *Sun*, as the Supreme God. I shall be very short in other Nations, and so close this Consideration.

And

And for what concerns the *Egyptians*, I have already given some Account of their *Theology*; and we may learn from thence, how it came to pass, that the *Sun* (whom none of the *Heathens* looked upon as absolutely the *supreme and highest Being*) is yet so often spoken of by them as such. For as *Jamblicus* informs us out of See before. the old *Egyptian Books*, they believ'd one *Supreme God* above all, next him the *Demiurgus*, and then *Ammon*, or the *Sun*; whom they esteem'd the *Supreme Visible God*, and as he who had the *Super-intendency* over the visible World. To which I will add the Authority of *Prophyry*, and that the rather for that in his Epistle to *Anebo*, he seems to suspect that the old *Egyptians* look'd Ensch. pr. Ev. lib. 3. no farther than the *Sun, Moon* and *Stars*. But 'tis plain that this was only a difficulty, which he puts to the *Egyptian Priest*; since himself owns that they represented the *Creator*, whom they call'd *Cneph*, with an Egg in his *Mouth*, to signify the *Production* of the World; and of which the *Sun* is but a Part.

And here I may not omit another Notion of the *Egyptians*, and which was not theirs only; and from whence we may again know how to understand those who seem to represent the *Sun* as the *Supreme Deity*. It was a Principle in their *Theology*, that the *Supreme God* of all, is not to be worshipped by any *External and Sensible thing*, not so much as by *Vocal Prayer*, but only by pure *Silence and Contemplation*: But that *Sacrifices* and *Hymns* were to be made to *Powers inferior to Him*. Among these they esteem'd the *Sun, Moon* and *Stars* to be the chief; from whence it was obvious enough to mistake, that because these were the *highest Deities*, to whom they paid any *External Adoration*, therefore they had no other superior to them. Porphy. de Abst. l. 2. Sect. 34.

Not. in Specim. Hist. Arab. p. 143.

Ibid. p. 140.

F. 76.

And now there remains only the *Chaldeans* and *Phenicians*, to be consider'd; and of these, both *Gregorius Abulfarajus* and *Sharestanus*, cited by our Learned Dr. *Pocock*, gives us Accounts very different from that of *Maimonides* before mention'd; and that *Judicious* and *Reverend Author*, justly esteems the Credit of *Abulfarajus*, preferable to *R. Maimon's*, for that he was better acquainted with their Writings, and read them in their own Language, which the other did not. And if what *Sharestanus* reports be true, That it was their Principle, that between the Supreme God and Us, there must be some Mediators; this again will furnish us with yet another Reason, why the *Sun* may easily have been mistaken for their Supreme Deity, because he was the principal Mediator betwixt God and them, and the Highest to which they paid any immediate External Adoration. And tho this Author is as positive, as if he had all the Evidence in the World for it, That God made an extraordinary Discovery of himself to Abraham, as Lord of all things, in opposition to the Idolatry of his own Country, by which he would imply that the *Chaldeans* in those days did not suppose God to be the Lord of all things; yet is it (like the rest of his Book) all Imagination, without any thing to support it. For indeed we have all the reason in the World to believe that the *Chaldeans* had at this time the knowledge of the one true God. 1. It appears by manifest Computation, that *Shem*, from whom *Tera* and *Abraham* were descended, was yet living with them, and it is altogether unaccountable, either that himself should have lost the knowledge of the one true Supreme God; or that if he retain'd it, all the rest of his Family should have been utterly ignorant of it.

†

2. It

2. It is indeed said in Holy Scripture, *Josb. xxiv. v. 2.* that they worshipped strange Gods; but it is not said that they either worshipped them as the *Supreme God*, or had utterly lost all *sense* and *apprehension* of any such *spiritual* and *invisible Godhead*. 3. In all the History of God's calling *Abraham* out of *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, we do not find any thing to make us believe that God was pleased to make the discovery of himself to him, as *Lord of all things*, in opposition to the *Idolatry* of his Family. 4. It is hard to suppose, that when all the barbarous Nations, as we have seen, preserv'd the Notion of the True, Supreme God, only these *Chaldeans* should lose it; it was but on the other side the River, that we find the knowledge of God preserv'd in the Land of *Canaan*. And lastly, we do certainly know, that but two Generations after *Laban*, tho he did worship (as it is said of *Tera*) *divi idolorum*, strange Gods too, yet he retain'd with them a very good *sense* and *apprehension* of the *Supreme God*, as is plain from *Gen. xxxi.* where the God of *Abraham* is found to appear to him, *v. 29.* And again *v. 53.* he ratifies his Covenant with his Son *Jacob*, swearing by the God of *Abraham*, as well as by the *strange God*, the God of *Nabor*.

To conclude; *Macrobius*, than whom none could have taken more pains to shew the universal Worship of the *Sun*, was yet so far from thinking that it excluded all *sense* and *apprehension* of a *Supreme God*, that he plainly says in the beginning, that he intended to treat only of the *Dij qui sub Cælo sunt*, the lower sort of *Worldly Gods*; and in his *Commentary* upon the *Dream of Scipio*, he plainly acknowledges a higher Divinity, whom he calls the *Prima Causa*, & *Omnipotentissimus*. Macrobi. Saturnal.

tentissimus Deus ; *The First Cause*, and most Almighty God.

Plutarch de I-
side & Osiride.

I shall close all with a passage of *Plutarch*, which will at once shew both that the Heathens had a knowledge of the *Supreme God* amongst them, and that it was *He* whom they all every where *Adored* as such, however differing in their *Manners* and *Ceremonies* from one another : ' *No inanimate thing can be a God to men ; but they who bestow upon us a continual supply of what is sufficient for us, have therefore been esteemed Gods by us ; which Gods are not different among different Nations, as if the Barbarians and Greeks, the Southern and Northern People had not the same God ; but as the Sun, and Moon, and Heaven, and Earth, and Sea, are common to all, but are called differently by different men ; so tho there be but ONE WORD, or REASON, ordering all those things, and but ONE PROVIDENCE dispensing all things, and the Inferior Powers which are appointed over all, having had several Names and Honours from several Persons, and by the Laws of several Countries, have been every where worshipp'd throughout the whole World.*

I pass on finally to enquire,

P. 97, 100.

3. Whether these Ancient *Idolaters*, as is pretended, did so Worship these *Heavenly Bodies*, as to Worship *nothing* besides, and in particular so as to exclude all *Notion* of *Heroes* and *Dæmons*.

This indeed is an *Assertion* worthy our *Author*, who as he has hitherto advanced nothing but *Paradoxes*, so he resolves he will not now alter his *Character* by representing *Antiquity* truly at the last.

I have

I have already shewn in opposition to this suggestion, how the *Egyptians* had their *Devi*, or *Canonized men* presently after the *Flood*; and that we have some reason to believe their principal *Deities*, viz. *Apis* and *Osiris*, to have been such; I will now add, that the first *Dynasties* of *Manetho*, of *Gods* and *Demi-Gods* upon Earth, confirms this, and to which the old *Egyptian Chronicon* in *Syncellus* adds yet more force. *St. Cyril* tells us from *Sanchoniathon*, that not only the most *Ancient Greeks*, but especially the *Phœnicians* and *Egyptians*, from whom this *Superstition* was derived to all others (tho our *Author*, ever in the wrong, will have the *Greeks* to be the *Inventors* of it) esteem-
 ed those the greatest *Gods*, τὰς τὰ ἀρχαῖς ἡρώων καὶ θεῶν
 ἡρώων, ἃς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡρώων τὰ ἴδια, who had either found out
 some things useful for the life of man, or otherwise deserved well of their Country. Εὐεργέτας τὴν πόλιν καὶ πολλὰς ἀγαθὰς
 ἀγαθὰς ἐργάσαντες, οἱ δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀνέστησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡρώων τὰ ἴδια
 τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἐργάσαντες, τὸν λαὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀγαθὰς ἐργάσαντες ὡς ἡρώων ἀνέστησαν.

P. 101.
 Cyrillus Alex.
 contra Julian,
 l. 6. p. 205. C. D.

And looking upon them as their *Benefactors* and *Causes* of great good to them, they worshipped them as *Gods*, and prepared *Temples* for that purpose, and consecrated *Pillars* and other *Ensigns* of *Honour* to their *Memory*. And as the *Holy Father* from the same *Author* goes on, *These* they greatly worshipped, and the *Phœnicians* especially, dedicated *Festivals* unto them.

But it was not enough for our *Author* merely to advance a most false Conclusion concerning these *Gentiles*, unless he also chuse an *Evidence* for it that speaks the direct contrary to his *Assertion*: For thus it became him to keep up a just *decorum* between his *Principles* and his *Proofs*, that so we may be satisfied, that he values *Truth* alike in both.

* This

Page 100.

' *This (says he) is attested by all Historians, viz. That the old Heathen Nations worshipped only the Stars, without any Notion of Heroes and Demons. And the very first he instances, in is Diodorus Siculus for the Egyptians.*

But this is perfectly to astonish us, and too plainly shews that some *mens assurance* is without bounds, as well as without reason: For what? Does *Diodorus Siculus* say that the *Egyptians* worshipp'd only the Stars, without any Notion of *Heroes* and *Demons*? This is worse than to write *History* out of an *Invisible Manuscript*; 'tis indeed to write *History* directly contrary to the *Visible Records* out of which he pretends to have taken it: For let this *Author* look into *Diodorus Siculus*, whom I would willingly hope he has never

Diodorus Si-
culus Ed. Ha-
nov. G. L. An.
1604.

yet read, and there he will find him in *his First Book*, so far from what he pretends, that on the contrary, he expressly distinguishes between two sorts of *Gods* among the *Egyptians*, and discourses of them in Order: And first of the *Celestial Gods*, p. 10. two of which he says the *Egyptians* first of all had, ἡ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη, the *Sun* and the *Moon*: Having discoursed of these, he thus formally concludes his Account, ' And this the *Egyptians* say concerning their *Celestial Gods*, and such as had an *Eternal Generation*.

Page 12.

Ibid.

And then goes on immediately on the *other sort*, which this *Author* pretends *Diodorus Siculus* denies them to have had ANY NOTION OF: ἄλλοι δ' ἐν τῷ αἰσθητῷ κόσμῳ παρὰ τὴν φύσιν, διὰ νόμον καὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐφευρέματα τῆς ἀθανασίας. But besides these (the *Sun* and *Moon*, &c.) they say there are other *Terrestrial Gods*, Mortals indeed by *Nature*, but for their *Wisdom* and *Prudence*, and the benefits they

they did to mankind, endued with Immortality; of which kind (says he) were some of the Kings of Egypt. In the next page he places amongst these, our Author's Friends, Isis and Osiris, whose History he relates: And finally, to raise his ill choice to the highest Evidence, having given a long relation of these kind of Deities, he concludes as directly against our Author's other Assertion, ' That this kind of Idolatry was the Invention of the vain and lying Greeks, as if he had been retain'd on our side, by shewing expressly how they derived this kind of Idolatry from the Egyptians, by the means of Orpheus, who had been initiated in the Egyptian Rites; and then gives us this universal Conclusion, p. 21. ἡ δὲ αἰνία ἡ ἐκείνη τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἡ ἐκείνη τῶν ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἡ ἐκείνη τῶν ἀνδρῶν. That the Egyptians do in general say, that the Grecians have appropriated to themselves the most eminent of their Heroes and Gods, as well as of their Colonies.

P. 13.

P. 101.

Diod. Siculus
p. 20, 21.

So much would it have been for our Author's Reputation, if Diodorus Siculus too, had been an Invisible Manuscript.

2. The next Author he produces, is Herodotus, who, he says, affirms the same of the Persians and Chaldeans, that they worshipped only the Stars, without any Notion of Heroes and Demons; but concerning the former part of his Assertion, I have already shewn, that they did not worship only the Stars, but acknowledged a Supreme Deity above them; and for the latter, the very same Herodotus who says this of the Persians, in his first Book, does directly contradict his Conclusion, ' That this was the sense of all the old Heathen Nations, but especially that the worshipping of

Page 100, 101.

Men and Women, was the Invention of the vain and lying Greeks, in the very next, where he tells us that they derived their Twelve Gods from the Egyptians, who were the first Inventors of this Idolatry.

Herodotus, l.
2. c. 4. p. 91.

3. The same (he says) in the next place is affirmed by *Strabo* and *Justin*, of the *Arabians*: Had he been pleased to produce some passages from these Authors wherein they do say, *That the Arabians worship only the Stars, without any Notion of Heroes and Demons*, we should have had less cause to suspect his Assertion; *Strabo* indeed says that the *Arabians* worship the *Sun*, but that either *He* or *Justin* have ever affirmed what this Author pretends, I am yet to learn; in the mean time this I am sure, that other Authors have given us a very contrary account of them. *Lucan* tells us, that their only God was *Jupiter Ammon*, whom that Learned Critick, *Gerard Vossius* does not without reason suppose to have been *Cham*, whose Eldest Son *Chus*, as I have before shewn, first planted himself there. *Arrian* in his History of *Alexander's Expedition*, says that they had two Gods, *Zeus*, or the Heaven, and *Διόνυσος*, or *Bacchus*; and that 'twas this encouraged that great Conqueror to invade them, that he might make himself a Third God amongst them; and this may be well enough consistent with the other Account, if what some Learned Men suppose, be allow'd; that these were their own proper Gods, whereas *Jupiter Hammon*, was rather the Deity of the *Ammonites*, among whom his Oracle stood, and to whom they only sent Ambassadors to consult upon occasion, it not appearing that the *Arabians* had any Temple for him in their own Country: So that here too our Author is mistaken, for that the

Strabo l. 16.
p. 539.

Lucan l. 9. v.
517.

Arrian de Ex.
ped. Alep. l. 7.
p. 486.

Ara-

Arabians had other *Gods* than the *Stars*, and were not without all Notion of *Heroes* and *Dæmons*.

Vossius de
dol. l. 1. c. 26.

4. His Fourth Instance is in the *Ancient Germans*, and of them I confess *Cæsar* does say what he pretends, but then it is to be observ'd, that in the very same place, he utterly overthrows all the use this *Author* can be supposed to make of it, viz. to shew, 'That all the old *Heathen Nations* worshipp'd only the *Stars*, without any Notion of *Heroes* or *Dæmons*; seeing in the very same place, he says of the *Ancient Gauls*, that they worshipp'd such kind of *Gods* as he denies any of the *Heathen* did, and that with a Superstition so like that of some of his Acquaintance, that I cannot forbear taking notice of it: 'The *Gauls*, says he, are very superstitious, and therefore if they fall into any dangerous distemper, or are concerned in War, or in any other danger, they straightway sacrifice, &c. For this purpose they have their particular *Gods*; Mercury to prosper them in their Journeys, or help them in their Traffick; Apollo to cure them in their sickness; Minerva to find out any Artificial Works; Mars for War, &c. And this our *Author* could not but know, since in the very Passage to which he refers, he opposes the *Germans* to them; the *Germans* (says he) differ much from this custom (viz.) of the *Gauls*, which he had just before recounted; for they esteem them only for *Gods* whom they see, and by whom they are manifestly help'd, the *Sun*, *Vulcan*, and the *Moon*.

Cæf. Com. 16.

But I have yet more to except against this instance; for however *Cæsar* came to be so misinformed, the *Ancient Germans* had other *Gods*, even such as this *Author* denies to all the *Ancient Idolaters*. *Tacitus* men-

Hist. l. 6.
Cap. 64.

Cap. 9.

Vof. de Idol.
l. 1. p. 240.De Moribus
Germ. c. 2.

Page 100.

tions *Mars* as the chief God of the *Tencteri*, a Nation bordering upon the *Rhine*; and in his Book *de Moribus Germanorum*, he speaks of *Hercules* as another of their *Deities*. That they also worshipped *Mercury*, we learn from the same Author, whom in their Language they called *Gota*, or *Wota*, as *Gotefridus Viterbiensis* in his *Chronicon* observes, from whence also he supposes, that their word *Got*, signifying *God*, is derived; tho in this, other Learned Men dissent from him.

And lastly, the same *Tacitus* mentions yet another God more Ancient than all these, the first Founder of their Country, *Tuisto*, whom they worshipped, with his Son *Manus*; and these, some think, were no other than *Gomar*, and his Son *Thogorma* or *Aschenar*, by whom *Germany* was peopled after the Flood, tho *Vossius* rather supposes them yet of a greater Antiquity, believing *Tuisto* to be *Adam*, and *Manus*, to whom also *Tacitus* assigns three Sons, *Noah*, by whom the World was again established after the Flood.

4. And this may suffice for his particular Authorities. His next are universal; for he says *Eusebius* in his Book *de preparatione Evangelica*, has shewn this to be the sense of all the Old Heathen Nations, as may be seen in his Collections of their several Opinions, where he proves, 'That the Ancient Heathens only worshipped the Stars, without any Notion of Heroes or Demons.'

Good God! What can be done with such a Man as this? *Eusebius* has proved that all the Ancient Heathens worshipped only the Stars, without any Notion of Heroes and Demons, which was a mere Invention of the vain and lying Greeks: And yet has this very

very *Eusebius* quoted *Diodorus Siculus*, for his account of the *Egyptian Theology*. He distinguishes with him their Gods into *Cæstial* and *Terrestrial*: Of the first, he Treats in his first Book from that Author; of the second in his next. The very Title of his Chapter is, *An Epitome of the Egyptian Theology, and how it passed from them to the Greeks*. In the beginning of it, he speaks how 'their Gods, who had been mortal Men, were for their Benefits they did to Mankind, and for their Wisdom, made immortal Deities. He exemplifies this in a large account of their *Mythology*; and then concludes expressly with his Author, *Τὴν ἑλληνικὴν θεολογίαν τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀνέβλεπον ἡρώων καὶ θεῶν τῶν αἰγυπτίων*. That the Greeks had appropriated to themselves, the principal Hero's, and Gods of the Egyptians. And yet this is the Author that has shewn at large, how all the old Heathen Nations worshipp'd only Stars, without any Notion of Hero's and Demons.

Euseb. præp. Evan. l. 2 c. 1.

Lib. 1. c. 7.

Lib. 2. c. 1.

P. 45.

Pag. 43, 46,

47, 48.

P. 100.

His other Author is *Macrobius*, who he says, has proved it of all the Ancient Idolaters, that they worshipped the *Sun* as the *Supreme Deity*. He should have added to make good his Conclusion, and that so as to exclude all Notions of Hero's and Demons. But this *Macrobius* never undertook to do; And I have before shewn, that in the very Book of his *Saturnals*, here mention'd, He was so far from shewing that they worshipp'd the *Sun* as the (absolutely) *Supreme Deity*, that in the beginning of his Discourse, he expressly restrains it to the *Dii duntaxat qui sub Cælo sunt*, or *Sub-Cæstial Deities*: And in his Comment upon *Scipio's Dream*, he acknowledges above the *Sun* and *Heaven*, many other Gods; viz. 1. An *Eternal Psythe*, the Creator both of the *Heaven*, and the *Sun*.

P. 100.

Sun. 2^{dly}, A perfect *Mind* or *Intellect*, and (as he calls him) *Omnipotentissimus Deus*, the most Omnipotent of all Gods.

5. He has two *Authors* whom he produces; our own Learned *Selden*, in his Book *De Diis Syris*, and *Gerard Vossius*, in nothing inferior to him, who have proved 'all the Idols mention'd in Scripture, to have been so many Appellations of the Sun, whom the Ancient Idolaters believed to have been the Supreme God, and Creator of the World, (and therefore of himself too, for he is part of it) as *Baal*, *Baal-Peor*, *Bel*, *Molech*, *Baal-Zebub*, and *Mythras*; tho I doubt this last was taken from some Invisible Manuscript of the Bible, for I do not remember that I have ever met with it in any of the Editions that are extant of those sacred Volumes.

But to let this pass too; Did Mr. *Selden* then, and *Gerard Vossius* in good Truth, undertake to shew, that all the Ancient Idolaters worshipp'd the Sun as the Supreme God, so as to exclude all Notion of Demons and Hero's?

1st, Mr. *Selden* gives only a Critical Account of the Syrian Deities; and in several of them shews, that others at least have believed them to be somewhat else than the Sun.

2^{dly}, *Gerard Vossius* is so far from favouring this Man's pretences, that on the contrary 'tis he, who has spent his whole first Book of Idolatry, to give an Account of the Ancient Hero's, that were consecrated by the Gentiles into Gods; 'Tis he that interprets the Egyptians *Osyris* to be *Mitxraim*; the *Beel* of the Chaldeans to be *Nimrod*; the *Tuisco* of the Germans, *Gomer*, or perhaps *Adam*. In short, he shews this

this sort of *Idolatry* to have been introduced among the *Heathens* the very Age after the *Flood*, even before God called *Abraham* from *Uz* of the *Chaldees*.

And thus have I consider'd this *Author's* Pretences to *Antiquity*; and I think I may say, there is nothing but *Falseness* and *Vision*, in all his *Notions* and *Authorities*. Upon the whole, I shall beg leave very briefly, to Conclude as to the Nature of *Idolatry*.

I. That seeing all these Ancient *Idolaters*, did acknowledge one *Supreme, Invisible* and *Spiritual* Godhead, their *Idolatry* did not consist in worshipping the *Heavenly Bodies*, so as to exclude all *Sense* and *Apprehension* of any such thing.

II. That seeing they believed the *Sun* and other *Heavenly Bodies*, to be the *Vehicles* only of *immaterial* and *spiritual Substances*, who had the *Superintendency* over the Affairs of this *lower World*, and were to be applied to as *Mediators* between God and Them; their *Idolatry* did not consist in worshipping any *Visible* or *Corporeal Deities*, as the *Supreme God*, so as to exclude all *Sense* and *Apprehension* of a *Spiritual* and *Invisible Godhead*, Superior to their *Deities*. By Consequence,

III. That either this, which our Author here lays down, is not (as he pretends) the *true* and *only Notion* of *Idolatry*; or if it be, none of those Ancient *Nations* were *Idolaters*.

IV. Tho I dare not presume to establish *true* and *only Notions* in this Case; yet from what has been said, I think we may reasonably Conclude their *Idolatry*, to have consisted especially in these two things;
 * * *
 Either,

either, 1st, That they worshipp'd the *true God* By *Corporeal* and *Visible Symbols*; or that 2^{dly}, together with the *true God*, they worshipp'd other *inferior Deities*; whether *Intelligences*, (which they supposed to reside in the *Heavenly Bodies*) or *Dæmons*. And that by consequence,

To Worship the *Supreme God* in any *Corporeal Representation* or *Image* whatsoever; or to pay *Divine Worship* to any *Created Being*, whether *Spirit* or *separate Soul*; either as having the Power over this *inferior World* to Administer things in it, or as *Mediators* between the *Supreme God* and *Us*; this is, if not the *only*, yet at least a *true Notion* of *Idolatry*.

C H A P. IV.

*Of the Notion of Idolatry under the Law;
and that it did not Consist in the giving
the worship of the Supreme God to some
Created, Corporeal or Visible Deity as
supposing it to be the Supreme God.*

THIS was the next point I proposed to examine,
and our Author thus delivers his Opinion of it.

"That according to the *Law*, Idolatry is giving Page 80.
"the worship of the Supreme God to any created,
"corporeal, or visible deity, or any thing that can
"be represented by an image, which nothing but
"corporeal Beings can, and to suppose such a Being Pag. 81.
"the Supreme Deity.

"And though there may seem to be two sorts of
"it. First, either to worship a material and created
"Being as the Supreme Deity, or Secondly to ascribe
"any corporeal Form or Shape to the Divine Nature;
"yet in the result both are but One; for to ascribe
"unto the Supreme God any Corporeal Form, is the
"same thing as to worship a Created Being, for so
"is every Corporeal Substance.

"This is, I say, the TRUE and ONE LT Notion
"of Idolatry.

This indeed is Great and Magisterial, and would
almost dispose a man to think, that there should cer-
tainly be at least something of Truth, where there
is so very much confidence. But we have had

L

already

already sufficient reason to suspect him, where he seems least to suspect himself. Here I cannot but wonder that a person of his *Character* should send abroad such *Notions* into the world for the *Diffates* of *Holy Scripture*, as are evidently contrary to the Tenor of it; unless he thought our *Nobility and Gentry* as little acquainted with that *Book*, as some of their *Guides* are said to have thought it fit they should be.

To make a man an *Idolater* according to the *Idea* this *Author* has given of it, two things are required, which I much question whether they ever yet concurred in any considerable number of men in the world, *viz.*

1. That he give the *worship* of the *Supreme God* to some *Created, Corporeal, and Visible* part of the Universe.
- 2^{dly}, That he give this *worship* to it as esteeming such a Being to be the *Supreme God*.

I will not be so rude as to enquire by what *Rules of Discourse* he infers all this from the *Second Commandment*, that because *God* there forbids the *Israelites* to make any " *Graven Image, the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath or in the water under the Earth; to bow down before it and worship it*; therefore, this *Image* must be the *similitude of some visible and Corporeal deity*; and that *Deity* be supposed to be the *Supreme God*, and be *worshiped* as such. He that can infer this from the *Second Commandment*, would doe well to tell us how he does it. But not to be importunate here. If this be the *true and only Idolatry*, according to the *Law*, I would desire to know;

First;

First, Seeing the Law was deliver'd by the Ministry of Angels, and these were no visible and Corporeal deities; what if the Jews had paid Divine Adoration to them? would this have been Idolatry according to the Law? If it would, I should be glad to know what part of his definition it is that makes it to be so?

Secondly, I have before shewn that the ancient Heathens, the Egyptians, Chaldeans, &c. though they worshiped indeed the Sun, Moon and Stars; yet they neither believed them to be the Supreme God nor the Image of the Supreme God; nor that they were only visible, and Corporeal deities: They look'd upon them as the vehicles of Celestial Spirits, which dwelt in them; and as such they pay'd their Adoration to them. Now then was this Idolatry by the Law, or was it not? If it were not, how came the Israelites to be charged with Idolatry (according to this Author's own principles) for joyning with them in this Service? If it were, how will this agree with his true and only Notion of Idolatry? Seeing they worship'd these Heavenly bodies neither as the Supreme God, nor so as to exclude all sense and apprehension of a spiritual and invisible deity. But,

Thirdly, To come to the Holy Scripture it self we read 1 Kings 11. that Solomon in his old age turned away his Heart, and worshiped אלהים אחרים other Gods, viz. Ashtoreth, and Milcom, and Chemoth, and Moloch, i. e. according to this Learned Man's Notion, the Sun, and Moon, and I suppose he will not deny that herein he committed Idolatry. But now can any one believe that Solomon who had been so well instructed in the knowledge of the Lord

--Vers. 4.

Collat. cum

Job. 24. 2.

pag. 93.

1 Kings 3. 5.
— 9. 2.

God of Israel; he to whom God had twice himself appeared; and whom he had endued with wisdom above all the men upon the Earth; finally who had not so long since built him a magnificent Temple at Jerusalem; where the Service of the true God was continued, even whilst he worshiped the Gods of his Wives. Can any one, I say, be so stupid as to believe that this Solomon gave the worship of the Supreme God to the Sun and Moon, as supposing them to be the Supreme deities, and that he did not only not worship but likewise not so much as believe the only Supreme God? And yet this we must say, if we will allow this Author to have given us the true and only notion of Idolatry.

Besides it is certain that whilst he was engaged in his Idolatrous worship, God did not utterly forsake him, but admonished him of it and threatened him with the loss of his Kingdom for serving strange Gods, which is inducement enough to conclude that he had still an apprehension of the True God. If Solomon did immediately upon this admonition give over his Impious worship, it shewed evidently that he retained the knowledge of that God who had twice appeared to him. For to suppose that he had quite lost all sense and apprehension of him just when he fell to Idolatry, and just recovered some sense of him upon this admonition, and that all the while between, he believed his visible and corporeal deities, or some one of them to be the Supreme God, and had no sense of him who is truly so, is to make Solomon almost such a man as I before shewed our Author's Idolater to be according to the meaning of his words: I am sure

sure it is not to make him one of the wisest men that ever was in the World. But supposing that *Solomon* went on for some time after this to worship his strange Gods, yet he must now at least have recovered some Sense of the *true God*, it being this admonition in all likelihood, that sooner or later brought him to Repentance: And then our Author's Principles do from that time that he was admonish'd, acquit *Solomon* of all *Idolatry*, though he went on to serve the Gods of his Wives.

It is a shame to run this matter any farther, and I make no doubt but that I have all men of Sense whether of ours, or of the Roman Church with me in this matter against our Author. But that I may not seem onely to destroy his *Idea*, without fixing any other in the room of it; I now proceed to observe, That we find two sorts of *Idolatry* mention'd in the *Old Testament*; and (such is the misfortune of this positive man,) both of them *utterly destructive* of his *true and onely Notion* of it, viz.

- I. The worshiping of the *true God*, by a *material Symbol* or *Representation*.
- II. The worshiping of *other Gods*, than the *God* of *Israel*, and that whether it be so as,
 1. Utterly to *forsake* the *true God*, and serve *others* onely, Or
 2. To worship *other Gods* together with *Him*.
- 1st. That according to the *Holy Scripture*, it was esteemed *Idolatry* among the *Jews*, to worship the *true God* by any *material Symbol* or *Representation*.

And I

And of this I shall desire no better proof, than those very instances which this Author so much insists upon, for the establishing of his Notion, viz. those of the *Golden Calf*, and of the *Calves of Dan and Bethel*. That the *Children of Israel* did commit *Idolatry* in the worship of these is on all hands agreed; And yet that both these were designed as Symbols, of the true God, and not of any visible or Corporeal deities, will I think appear evident, almost to a demonstration, from these following reflexions.

1st. That it is altogether incredible that the "*Israelites* in either of those Cases, could so soon have forgotten the true God, as to give divine worship to visible and Corporeal Beings, as supposing them to be the supreme Deity.

If we consider their Circumstances when they worshipped the *Golden Calf*, *Exod. 32*. It was but a very few days since God had made a very great discovery of Himself to them at Mount *Horeb*, when he gave them the Law, and asserted Himself to be the *Jehovah*, their God which had brought them up out of the Land of Egypt, *Exod. 20. 1*.

And in the Case of *Jeroboam's Calves*, the knowledge of God in which they had been bred up; a continued publick Service of Him at *Jerusalem*; the Feasts and Sacrifices, and other Ceremonies which they observed in Obedience to his Command, the very Seal of his Covenant which they carried about them in their *Flesh*, not to say any thing of that Temple which *Solomon* had so lately built unto him; all these must certainly have made too deep an Impression upon their minds, to permit them so suddenly to fall away into such an utter forgetfulness of him,

him, as to worship *visible and corporeal deities* as the *supreme God*; so as to exclude all *sense and apprehension* of him who really is the *supreme God*. Such an Ignorance as this is hardly to be found, even among those *Infidels* that have never had any revelation of the *true God* at all made to them: But that Men who had once been instructed in the *knowledge* and worship of him, should so suddenly fall off from both, as they must here have done according to this *Author's true and onely Notion* of their *Idolatry*, this I think is as *incredible*, as the notion it self, which he would prove by the supposition of it. But, 2dly. That the people did not fall into any "such *Apostasie*, but design'd in those *Calves* to worship the *God of Israel*, is evident from the *Characters* given "of that *deity* whom they served by them.

For as to the *Golden Calf*, we read *Exod. 32. 4* that when it was set up they cry'd out, "This is thy *God O Israel*, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt, and *Aaron* built an Altar before it, and "made proclamation and said, to Morrow is a Feast to the *Jehovah* or the Lord.

And so *Jeroboam* in the very same manner, having set up his *Calves* in *Dan* and *Bethel*, 1 *Kin. 12. 28*. "It is too much for you (said he to the people) to go "to *Jerusalem*; Behold thy *God O Israel*, which "brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt. Now may I desire this *Learned Author* to tell us. 1. Where in *Holy Scripture* do's he find the name *JEHOWAH*, or the *LORD* attributed to any other but the *true God*? Or if we should suppose the people to be Ignorant in this Case, yet could *Aaron* the *High-priest* be so forgetfull, as not to remember that this was that
peculiar

peculiar name which God assumed to himself, *Exod. 6. 3.* and of which our Author himself takes notice, *p. 80. 81.* 2. Whom should they then, and *Jeroboam* mean after by the *Jehovah* that had brought them up out of the Land of Egypt, but him who at the delivery of the Law, appropriated this Character to himself, *Ex. 20. 1.* and who was under that Title worshiped by the Jews at Jerusalem where his Temple stood, and whither all the Tribes were wont to go up to worship him. *It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem. Behold thy God, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt.*

3. Had *Jeroboam* hereby designed to set up a new God amongst them, how came it to pass that He used no Arguments with them at all as to that matter, but merely remonstrated to them the trouble of going up to Jerusalem to worship? Never sure were people easier persuaded out of their religion than the ten Tribes, if our Author thinks, that the distance of place made him chuse rather to return to the Idolatry of Egypt, than to be at so much pains to worship the true God.

3dly. But all this will farther appear, in that it is altogether incredible that the Egyptian Gods should be the God that delivered the Israelites out of the hand of Egypt; and sent all those Plagues upon their own servants. But especially that thick darkness under which they lay for three days, seems to be a very odd Effect for the Sun to have wrought. But to quit such Suppositions; Two things there are by which it undoubtedly appears that the Israelites in these Cases, could not have design'd any return to the Egyptian Idolatry. For,

1. As

As to the *Golden Calf*, it is said that they offer'd burnt offerings, and brought Peace offerings unto it. And *Jeroboam* sacrificed unto the *Calves* which he had made and *Consecrated Priests* with a bullock and seven vains to their Service.

Now all this was most agreeable to what God required in his Service: but so utterly repugnant to the *Superstition* of the *Egyptians* that our Author himself confesses God commanded their beasts to be offer'd in Sacrifice to him, in contempt of the Sacredness in which they were held by those *Idolaters*. He tells us " That to offer a young *Ram* was the greatest affront that could be put upon the *Egyptians*, " who held a *Ram* not onely in religious esteem, " but the most sacred of all their *Holy Animals*, " And particularly upon the account of the sacredness of these *Animals*, the *Egyptians* (says he) " NEVER OFFER'D any of their Species in Sacrifice. In so much that when *Pharaoh* bid " *Moses* go sacrifice to the Lord in the Land of *Egypt*, " *Moses* answers that they durst not doe it, because Exod. 8. 25. " it would be an *Abomination* to the *Egyptians*, so that " they would stone them: that is, it would be a prophaneness and open affront to the Religion of the " *Egyptians* if they should offer in Sacrifice those " very *Animals* that the *Egyptians* had consecrated " to the Honour of their Gods. And for the same " reason the *Israelites* were also commanded to Sacrifice young-Bullocks, as well as *Rams*; for that " next to a *Ram* the *Bullock* was the most Sacred of " all the *Holy Animals*.

Our Author is very large on this Argument; but I think what I have here offer'd, is little less than

than a demonstration against him as to this point ; that the Jews in the Worship of their Calves did not return to the Idolatry of Egypt, seeing they offer'd such Sacrifices before them as by his own confession were an open affront to the Religion of the Egyptians.

2dly. It is evident from Holy Scripture, that the Idolatry of these Calves was a distinct Idolatry from that of worshipping the Heavenly Bodies ; and according to the Estimate which God himself put upon it, much less heinous. And this we find in both the instances before mention'd. For as to the Golden Calf, Stephen says Acts 7. 41, 42. " That they made a Calf in those days, and offer'd Sacrifice to the Idol, and rejoyced in the work of their hands ; THEN God gave them up to worship the Host of Heaven. Now here must be a manifest difference allow'd between these two, seeing the one is represented as the punishment of the other, and what a ridiculous paraphrase would it make of these words, to suppose that they Adored the Sun in both ; viz. " That for worshipping the Sun, under the Symbol of the Golden Calf, God gave them up to worship the Sun under the name of Moloch.

As for Jeroboam's Calves, we find this also distinguish'd from that of worshipping the Heavenly Host. For thus the Idolatry of Ahab was aggravated against him ; 1 Kings 16. 31. That " as if it had been a small thing for Him to walk in the Sins of Jeroboam the Son of Nebat ; He went and served Baal, and worshipped Him. Now if the Idolatry of the Golden Calves was the worship of the Sun too, (as this Author would have it,) then this passage concerning Ahab must be expounded in this manner;

manner ; " That as if it had been a small thing for him to worship the *Sun* under the *Calves*, He even proceeded to such a height of *Impiety*, as to worship the *Sun* under the name of *Baal*. But *truly*, and to conclude this Point ; That under the *Calves* they worshiped the *true God*, is evident from the whole Course of the History of the ten Tribes, and of the *State of Religion* under them. We find *God* as well revealing himself to these as to the other two. His Prophets came amongst them, and though they often inveigh'd against their *Altars*, yet never charged them as deserters of the *God of Israel*.

Nay, in many Cases we find those who worshiped the *Golden Calves*, yet accepted by *God* as zealous in his Service. I shall instead of many, offer onely one Example, that of *Jehu*. 2 Kings 10. 16. who as he was expressly design'd by *God* to be *King* over *Israel*, so he there bids *Jehonadab*, " come and see his Zeal for the *LORD*. Now the zeal he there meant was in destroying of *Baal* out of *Israel*. This he most Effectually did, as may be seen at large in that Chapter ; and for the doing of it, had the Throne confirm'd by *God* to his Posterity for four Generations. I shall therefore make bold to conclude, that *Jehu* was no worshipper of *Baal* or the *Sun*, but of the *God of Israel*, whose Service he promoted, and for whom *Elijah* not long before had appeared in opposition to this very *Baal*, 1 Kings 18. 21. How long (says he) Halt ye between two opinions, if the Lord be *God* follow him ; but if *B A A L* then follow him. And yet *Jehu* still worship'd the *Golden Calves* that were in *Bethel*, and that were in *Dan* ; He observed not to walk in the Law of the *LORD*.

2 Kings 10.
29, 31.

God of Israel with *ALL HIS HEART*, seeing he departed not from the Sin of Jeroboam which made Israel to Sin.

I conclude upon the whole, that that cannot be the true and *ONELY* Notion of Idolatry which this Author pretends, viz. "The giving the worship of the Supreme God to some Created Corporeal or visible Deity, as supposing it to be the Supreme deity, since (as we have now seen) to worship even the true God, under the worship of some Corporeal Symbol or representation, as the Israelites did in these Calves, is in the account of the Holy Scripture to commit Idolatry. I go on,

2dly. To shew: That to worship any other God, besides the God of Israel, whether it be so as to forsake the true God, or but onely to joyn the worship of any other with him; This is also according to the sense of Holy Scripture, to commit Idolatry.

Now this will appear from the Examples of this kind of Idolatry, that occur in those Sacred Writings; I shall mention onely an Instance or two in either kind. And,

1st. That to give divine worship to any other than to the God of Israel, though they do not worship that Being as the Supreme deity, but on the Contrary worship the true God together with it, is according to the Censure of the Holy Scripture Idolatry.

This was the Case of Solomon in some of the last years of his Life, For however, at the persuasion of his Wives; he neglected very much the Service of the

the true God, yet we do not find that he utterly forsook either the *Worship* or the *acknowledgement* of him. On the Contrary, the *Holy Scriptures* plainly enough insinuates, that he still served the God of *Israel*, and his fault was, that he did not serve him onely, but worshiped *Molech*, and *Chemosh* and *Asteroeth*, and *Milcom* together with him. For thus speaking of his Idolatry it says, 1 Kings 11. 4. *That his heart was not perfect, with the Lord his God*: and again ver. 6. *That he went not fully after the Lord as did David his Father*, i. e. He did not wholly give up himself to serve the Lord, and him *ONELY* as his Father had done.

Another, and a more notable Instance of this we meet with in 2 Kings 18. Where the King of *Affyria* having led the ten Tribes into Captivity, and planted some of his own Subjects in their Countrey, we read ver. 24. that God sent *Limraman* ^{ver. 25.} *to destroy them, because they neglected to worship him*. Upon this the King of *Affyria* ordered one of the Priests of *Bethel* to go up and teach them, ^{ver. 27.} *"the manner of the God of the Land; then one of the Priests whom they had carried away from Samaria, came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear or serve the Lord. Howbeit every man made Gods of his own, and so they feared the Lord and served their own Gods and their Graven Images."* ^{28.}

Such was the State of these *Samaritans*, and their practice will furnish us with two very usefull Remarks upon this Occasion. For 1. Since these *Samaritans* were punished for not worshipping the God of the Countrey, i. e. of the God whom the *Israelites* were.

were wont to worship; it follows that the God of the *Israelites* was not the same with the God of the *Samaritans*; And therefore since these are supposed to have worshipped the *San*, it follows that the *Israelites* did not worship the *San*; but some other and him the true God.

2dly. That these *Samaritans* at the same time that they committed *Idolatry* in serving their own Gods, did also both know and fear the true God, and therefore their *Idolatry* could not consist in giving the worship of the Supreme God, to their created and visible Deities, as supposing them so to be. But their Sin was that they gave divine worship to their own false Gods, after they had been instructed in the worship of the true, and joyned both the one and the other in their Religious Service. But,

3dly. As it was therefore thought to be *Idolatry*, to worship any other being together with God, so must it much more have been esteemed so, to forsake the true God, and worship any other Corporeal and visible Deity.

1 Kings 16.
30.

6 An Instance of this we seem to have in *Ahab*, who seduced by *Jezebel* his Wife, did evil in the sight of the Lord, above all that were before him, and what this was we find in the next verse, viz. That not content with the *Idolatry* of *Jeroboam*, in worshipping God after an *Idolatrous* manner, he utterly forsook him and served *Baal*, and built a Temple and an Altar for him.

1 Kings 18.
4.

Now that *Ahab* had utterly laid aside the Service of the true God, seems evident upon two accounts, 1st. Of the Great persecution that he suffered his Wife

to make of the Prophets of the LORD; *1 Kings 18.*
 4. When as *Obadiab* tells *Elijah*, he hid them in
Caves from her fury. 2dly. From the miserable State
 of the Kingdom, in that time as we find *Elijah* re-
 porting it even to God himself, *1 Kings 19. 14.*
"The Children of Israel, says he, have forsaken thy
"Covenant, thrown down thy Altars, and slain thy
"Prophets with the Sword, and I even I only am left,
"and they seek my Life to take it away.

Indeed it is not to be doubted, but that the Idolatry
 of this time was very deplorable. But now where in did
 it consist? Did *Ahab* worship *Baal* or the *Sun* as a
Corporeal Deity, so as to exclude all Sense and appre-
 hensiveness of a *Superiour, Spiritual and Invisible God-*
head? This is not credible, seeing throughout his
 whole Reign we find him corresponding upon all
 occasions with the Prophets of the LORD, and there-
 fore sure he could not be without some Sense and ap-
 prehension of him.

And what I have now shewn in the Example of
Ahab I will yet farther confirm in another, that will
 perhaps be liable to less exception, and that is the in-
 stance of *Manasse* King of *Judah*. This King not
 content to forsake the God of his Fathers set up his
 Idolatry in the very Temple of the Lord; but yet
 neither had he lost all sense and apprehension of
 a *Spiritual and Invisible Godhead*. He had been
 bred up by his Father in the knowledge of the true
 God, the Prophets of the LORD still continued to
 put him in mind of his danger, and no sooner did
 he feel the punishment of his Rebellion, but he re-
 turned to his God, ver. 12. "When he was in afflicti-
 on he besought the Lord his God, and humbled him-
 self

" *Self greatly before the God of his Fathers.*

And thus have I taken a short View of the several sorts of *Idolatry* which occur in the *Old Testament*, and from thence it appears, that this sin is consistent not only with the *acknowledgment* but even with the *worship* of the *true Supreme Deity*, and therefore that it is a very false account, which this Author has here given us of it, *viz.* " *That Idolatry*

Page 74.

" *is neither more nor less than the Worship of the heavenly bodies, the Sun, Moon and Stars or any other visible and Corporeal Deity as the SUPREME*

Page 80, 81.

" *God; or as he elsewhere defines it, that Idolatry is the giving the worship of the Supreme God to any Created, Corporeal or Visible Deity, and to suppose such a Being the Supreme Deity is the ONE, TRUE and PROPER IDOLATRY.*

But before I quit this point it may not be amiss to observe yet one instance more of *Idolatry*, (I am sure generally supposed at least to be so) and which I cannot tell whether it may properly be reduced to any of the foregoing kinds, and it is that of the *Brazen-Serpent* to which the Children of *Israel* burnt *Incense* in *Hezekiah's* time, as we may see *2 Kings 18. 4.* This pious King observing their superstition caused it to be broke into pieces, and we find this recorded among the Rest of his *Enterprizes*, for *Rooting Idolatry* out of his Country. " *He Removed the High places and brake the Images, and cut down the Groves, and brake in pieces the Brazen-Serpent, that Moses had made: for unto those days the Children of Israel did burn Incense to it, and he called it Nehushtan.*

I do

I do not believe that even this *Author* himself will have the confidence to say that this was an *Image* of either the *Sun*, *Moon* or *Stars*, or of any other *Visible* and *Corporeal Deity*, or that the people *Worshipped* it as supposing it to be *the Supreme God*, so as to exclude all *sense* and *apprehension* of a *spiritual* and *Invisible Godhead*, and yet the learned men on both sides confess, that here was *Idolatry* committed, though it may be *the people* were far from thinking that they did so, and then it will remain "that to give any *appropriate Acts* of *divine Worship* to any *Creature*, whatever *sense* men have of "the *thing* to which they give them, or their *Intension* be in so doing, is nevertheless esteemed by "God to be *Idolatry*."

N CHAP.

C H A P. V.

The objections against the Notion of Idolatry laid down in the foregoing Chapter consider'd, and refuted.

Since I first began the examination of this *Book*, I have been under some temptations to doubt whether the *Author* of it really designed to serve the interest of those of the *Church of Rome* in the writing of it, or by a seeming defence of their *Idolatry*, intended onely to shew how little he could say in their behalf, and to give us an occasion by Answering his Arguments to convince the World upon what just *Grounds* we advance that *Charge* against them.

It does indeed a little startle me when I consider how base a thing it is, and unbecoming the Character of a *Christian*, to put on onely an appearance of Zeal in behalf of a *Party*, to whom it must be confess'd he has been highly Obliged, and whom therefore if he could not serve, yet at least he ought not to have betray'd. But then it seems to be something worse, I do not now say for a *Christian*, but for a *Bishop* that has not yet quitted either the *Revenues* or the *Communion* of the *Church of England*, nor retracted the *subscription* he once made of this very charge of *Idolatry* against those for whom he would now be thought to plead; to revile that *Church* which nourishes him, and whose *Opinions* we must suppose

suppose him to hold, till we see him as formally renounce them, as ever he once subscribed to them. And if on the one hand he seems to shew a great deal of bitterness against us in his *Expressions*, yet on the other, it must be confessed his Arguments are so extremely civil as not to carry so much as the appearance of Reason in them. And few of the *Romanists* have ever undertaken this cause, that have not said a great deal more in their own defence, than this *Amphibious Advocate* has offer'd for them.

But whether this *Author* designed to expose them or us or himself onely, as I am not much concern'd to know, so neither will I undertake to determine. This is plain, that had he meant to ridicule the Church of Rome never so much, he could not have taken a more effectual way of doing it. And whether our *Nobility* do, or can, or ought to understand *Transubstantiation* or no, yet I am sure men of much meaner capacities than those *Honourable Personages* for the most part are, will be able to discern the truth of this remark. And that he must indeed have thought them not onely incapable of judging of *Abstracte propositions*, but even destitute of Common sense and reason, if he hoped to impose such discourse as this upon them for *Arguing*.

Now to make this appear, I shall need onely desire the Reader to observe with me these two things:

I. That the position he undertakes to defend is, that the notion of *Idolatry* in holy Scripture is neither MORE nor LESS than this. "The worship of the Heavenly bodies, the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, or any other visible and Corporeal Deity, as the

N 2

"Supreme

" *Supreme God, so as to exclude all sense and apprehension of a spiritual and invisible Godhead.*

II. That to prove this, it is not sufficient to shew, that this is *Idolatry*, or that the *Jews* did sometimes fall into it: But it must be shewn that they never committed any other *Idolatry*; and particularly that this was the *Idolatry* of the *Golden-Calf*, and of the *Calves* of *Dan*, and *Bethel*. For though the *worship of the Heavenly Bodies*, (as the *Author* represents it) were one sort of *Idolatry*, yet if the *Scripture* has charged the *Jews* with this *Guilt* for any other *worship*, wherein they did not adore the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*, or any other *visible and Corporeal Deity* as the *Supreme God*, it will then follow that this, which is alledged, cannot be the *ONELY* *Notion* of *Idolatry*, and it must be false to assert, that *Idolatry* according to the word of *God* is neither *MORE* nor *LESS* than this.

Page 80, 81.

Page 74.

Page 83.

Now from these two remarks onely, it will presently appear what slender pretences some men will take up with to run out into the most excessive clamours against those whom they oppose. For, 1st. As to what he so largely insists upon, as if there were something very important at the bottom of it, viz. *That the Jews were a people prone to Idolatry, and that the design of God throughout the whole Law, was to preserve them from it*, though it be a great truth, yet it is certainly in this place a great impertinence. Seeing neither do we deny this, nor can he make any use of it, in establishing his true and onely notion of *Idolatry*. For I hope he did not intend to argue thus, *The Jews were very prone to Idolatry, and God intended his Law to restrain them from*

from it; Therefore *Idolatry* is neither more nor less, than the worship of the *Heavenly bodies*, the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*, as the *Supreme Deity*.

2dly. It will from hence appear, that all those passages of *Holy Scripture*, where God charges the *Jews* with *worshipping other Gods*, with *servng the Hoast of Heaven*, &c. conclude nothing, seeing it is confessed that they did fall into *this Idolatry too*; but that does not hinder but that they may have fallen into *some other* besides; and we are assured that so they did; nay, that they were suffered by God to fall into this, as a *punishment* for having committed the other, so *St. Stephen* expressly tells us, *Acts* 7. 41, 42. *They made a Calf in those days, and offered Sacrifice to the Idol, and rejoyced in the work of their hands. THEN God gave them up to worship the Hoast of Heaven.*

Nor is it any more to the purpose, 3dly, to prove Pag. 99. that the *Scripture* says, that to worship the *Sun* and *Moon* is *Idolatry*; unless he could find out some *Text* where it adds, that they who worshiped the *Sun* and *Moon*, worshiped them as visible and Corporeal Deities with the *Honor due to the Supreme God*; and so as to exclude all sense and apprehension of a spiritual and invisible Godhead, and that this is the true and only *Idolatry*. But now this which was the only point in question, he has prudently forgot, and whilst he lives will never be able to prove it.

In short if there be any thing more than *noise* and *shew* in what he has said, it must be in his Account of the two points before consider'd. viz. *The Golden-Calf* and the *Calves* of *Dan* and of *Betbel*: For as for the *Brazen-Serpent* and the honor paid to that, he is as silent as if there had been no such thing in his *Bible*.

For

For the former of these, the *Golden-Calf*, he expatiates very much, but sure never were *Words* put together with less pertinence than here. The thing
 Pag. 84. 85, to be proved is, *that the Jews intended by this Calf*
 &c. *to worship the Egyptian Apis or Serapis or Osyris, that is, the Sun as the Supreme Deity.*

But how does he go about to prove this. *First*, He learnedly shews that the *Apis* whom the *Egyptians* worshiped was not the *King* of the *Argives*, nor *Son* to *Jupiter*. And this I think may be foreign enough to what we are seeking, which is the design of the *Jews* in setting up the *Golden-Calf*. *Secondly*, He assures us 'tis much more propable that the *Greeks* borrowed the very word *Apis* from the *Egyptians*. And thereupon he takes occasion to make a Learned reflexion upon our *Translation* of *Jer. 46. 15.* which it may be was one of the passages for which he has been wont to censure our *version* with as little *Modesty* as *Understanding*. For to say no more of it than this, if we have rendred this Verse amiss we have erred not onely with all the *Learned Versions* the *Syriack*, the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, and even the *Vulgar Latin* it self, but with the *Original Hebrew* too; and in all which there is this onely Difference, that what they call *Valiant* in one Number, we render *Valiant Men* in the other. And all this is still as impertinent to the *Point* in hand, as any thing can well be imagined to be.

And yet from this, *Thirdly*, He boldly infers,
 Ibid. " *That the Calf must have been the Symbol of some*
 " *Egyptian Idol, and that the people thinking them-*
 " *selves betray'd or deserted by Moises after forty days*
 " *absence forced Aaron to restore to them the Symbols*
 " *of*

" of their old Gods to go before them, instead of this new
 " God that seemed to have deserted them. And this
 indeed is pertinent, but it has another terrible defect,
viz. that it wants proof. In short the onely reason he
 has to offer for what he says, is this; *That all their
 other worship seems to have been forced and constrained,
 but this is free and voluntary: And that there could
 be no other Ground of that great joy they shew'd on this
 occasion, but that they were restored to the Exercise of
 their former Religion.* And to this I have many things
 to reply.

First, That this is at best but a plausible presumption, and such as if compared with the reasons I have
 alledged to the contrary, will not be thought to de-
 serve the name of an *Argument*. For,

Secondly, Whereas this Author (always positive, Pag. 88.
 if that might pass for proof) says, *that there
 could be no other ground of this joy than that they were
 restored to the worship of their old Gods;* I would
 fain know how he comes to be assured of this? I am
 confident were it fit to establish a *Principle* of this
 moment upon the *sandy Foundation* of our own *Con-
 jectures*, one might be able to find out other reasons
 for it. For why might they not have had just cause
 of rejoycing to behold a *Symbol* of their own God set
 up amongst them, as well as if it had been a figure
 of an *Egyptian Idol*? what if despairing of *Moses's* re-
 turn to them, as they design'd this *Symbol* to supply
 his place, to direct them in their journey, and to be
 an *Oracle* at which they might continually enquire
 God's pleasure, so they testified some transports of
 joy upon the erecting of it? Nay but,

Thirdly,

Thirdly, What if we should say that we cannot discern any such *extraordinary* joy, more than what the Solemnity of a *Feast* Dedicated to the *JEHOVAH* for the setting up of a visible *Symbol* of his *presence* amongst them might very well warrant? The case in short was this; *Moses* delay'd to come down from the *Mount*, the people were impatient to continue on their Journey towards the *Promised Land*; but how to learn *God's* pleasure they knew not, and for this purpose they cryed unto *Aaron*, that he would make them a *God* to go before them; such as very probably they had seen in *Egypt*, and which might serve instead of an *Oracle* unto them. This *Aaron* makes, and for the *Dedication* of it appoints a *Feast* unto the *Lord*, and offers such *Sacrifices* as *God* indeed required, but which this *Author* himself confesses were an *Abomination* to the *Egyptians*: And upon the occasion of this *Feast* it was that it is said, *They rejoyced in the works of their hands*. Acts 7. 41. And again, *The people sate down to eat and drink and rose up to play*, 1 Cor. 10. 7. And what this joy was we find particularly expressed, *Exod.* 32: 19. *They were singing, and dancing before the Calf*. Now all this was very natural on such an occasion; and what ever sin they committed in it, yet I cannot see any necessity there is to conclude that there could be no other ground for such a joy than their returning to the *Idols* of *Egypt*. And the Arguments I have before given clearly shew that whatever it was, it could not be that, seeing that the whole Solemnity was consecrated to the *JEHOVAH*, and performed in a manner utterly inconsistent with the *Egyptian Idolatry*.

As for the Calves of Dan and Bethel, our Author has (if possible) yet left to say against their being the Symbols of the God of Israel, than he had in the former Case. He produces only the Learned *Pistina* Pag. 99 to prove that *Menchas* was mistaken in imagining that *Jeroboam* set up these Calves in imitation of *Solomon's Cherubim*. But now this is not our question, whether the Calves were made in imitation of the Cherubim, but whether the God of Israel, or the Gods of Egypt were worshiped by the Ten Tribes at Dan and Bethel? And yet without saying one pertinent word, he concludes, with as good Assurance as if he had made a demonstration of it; "So that it is plain that these Calves were set up by him as Idols, or Symbols of a new or separate Religion from the Tribe of Judah."

One thing indeed there is that may seem to deserve an Answer, and that is, why the people for three whole years did not comply with him, if he kept up the old Religion that had been established under David and Solomon? But now this is a gross Mistake in a person that would be thought so Learned in the Scriptures. The people did comply very readily with *Jeroboam*, and were far from refusing for any such time as is pretended. And that passage to which this Author must, I suppose, refer 2 Chron. 11. 17. is spoken not of the Israelites, but of the Kingdom of Judah; namely, that for three years they walked in the way of David and Solomon.

And now let any reasonable man consider what a pitifull Vindication is this, to support so much Clamour and confidence? And how must all men of sense, even in the Roman Communion despise such trifling

fling after what they have seen their own *Dr. Godden* perform upon this very subject? The truth is we ought to give that *Learned Man* his due. He has said what was to be said to excuse his *Church* from *Idolatry*; and his performance shews that he wanted nothing but a better *Cause* to have acquitted himself to every one's satisfaction. But he had a hard *Mistress* to serve, and he was not unsensible of it. But for this new *Advocate* his Arguments are as much short of the *Doctor's*, as his assurance is greater. There the *D. of Paul's* found something worthy his consideration, but here is nothing but a *great noise*, and a great deal of Anger and Scorn, without any just occasion, though in such a Case the Cause ought to be very plain. In short, I cannot imagine any other effect this *Discourse* can possibly have than to raise the Credit of *Dr. Godden's*; and after whom it is indeed a bold undertaking for another to engage: for could this *Point* have been defended, he was the *Person* that of any other seems to have been the most likely to have done it. But he too has fail'd, and because his performance was good, considering the matter of it, the worth of the man argues the badness of the *Cause*, and the impossibility of defending it.

That the Account which has been given of the Notion of Idolatry under the Law, is equally applicable to the Case of the Christians now. The Objection from the Cherubims answered: and the whole concluded.

I Am now come to the last point to be considered, and it is indeed so necessarily consequent upon the foregoing, that if what I have before said concerning the *Notion of Idolatry* under the *Old-Testament* be allowed, this cannot be denied: viz. *That as the Jews retaining both the Apprehension and worship of the truly Supreme God, were nevertheless guilty of Idolatry, for worshiping him after a Gentile manner, so may Christians be now, and therefore that the Church of Rome may justly be charged by us as Idolatrous, though we do not pretend in any wise to say either that she worships the Sun, Moon, and Stars, or any other visible and Corporeal Deity as the Supreme God, or that she has lost all Apprehension of a Spiritual and invisible Godhead.*

I shall not much enlarge my self upon the *proof* of a *Consequence*, both in it self very plain, and which this *Author* is so far from denying, that his *whole Book* is built upon the *Supposal* that he makes of the *truth* of it; It is indeed the onely thing wherein he seems to have any reason, nor can any thing be more

just than for the understanding what *Idolatry* is to search the *Holy Scriptures*, and see what is there declared to be so.

As for the *New-Testament*, we find the *Apostles* earnest indeed in their *Cautions* against *Idolatry*, but we do not see that they any where defined the *Nature* of it; They spake as to men who understood these things, and were acquainted with the *Nation* of *Idolatry*, and needed onely to be warn'd against falling into it. They give not the least intimation that it was not the same then, it had ever been esteemed before, or that *Christians* were to think any otherwise of it, than the *Jews* had been wont to do under their *Law*. All we can conclude from their *Exhortations* to the *Christians* to avoid it is, that *Christians* were capable of falling into it, and by consequence that Men who have not lost all *Sense* and *Apprehensions* of a *Supreme*, *Spiritual* and *Invisible* *Godhead* may for all that become *Idolaters*.

So that to know what the *Scripture* *Notion* of *Idolatry* is, we must with this *Author* search into the *History* of the *Old Testament*, and from thence I have shewn two *Cases* wherein Men may without excluding either the *Sense* or *Worship* of the *true God*, yet justly be charged with this *Crime*. I. By worshipping the *true God*, by any *Corporeal Image* or *representation*. II. By giving *divine Worship* to any other besides *God*, though they do not onely retain the *Notion*, but even the *Adoration* too of the *true God* together with it.

It were an easie matter to enlarge upon both these *points* here in the *Application* of them, but my design now is not to accuse any *particular Church* of this *Guilt*,

Guile, but onely to shew in General what *Idolatry* it self is, and that the *Church of Rome* though it both *knows* and *worships* the *true God* yet may do it in such a manner, and give such *worship* to *other beings*, as justly to deserve the censure which has been brought against her, for any thing this *Author* has said to clear her of it.

Indeed as to the former of these ways whereby I pretend a Man may be guilty of *Idolatry*, viz. By *worshipping God* by any *Corporeal Image* or *Representation*, he has offer'd somewhat in prejudice of it. For did not *God himself* command two *Cherubims* to be made, and used in his worship? and were not these *Sacred Images* set up in the place of worship, and does not this shew that *God* was so far from forbidding the use of *Images* in his *Service*, that he would not be worshipped without them? pg. 125. 127.

But, to this I answer that *God* did indeed command two *Cherubims* to be made and placed at the two ends of the *Mercy Seat*; But that they were put there for any use to be made of them in his *Service*, or for any other purpose than to over-shadow the *Mercy Seat*, from whence *God* had promised to deliver his *Oracles* unto them, this we utterly deny.

Hence we find that when *God* had directed *Moses* how to make this *Throne* of his glory, *Exod.* 25. 22. he commanded him, To put the *Mercy Seat* above upon the *Ark* of the *Testimony*, and there (says he) I will meet thee, and I will commune with thee from above the *Mercy Seat* from between the two *Cherubims* which are upon the *Ark*, and in the VIIth. of *Numbers* ver. 89. It is said, That when *Moses* went into,

into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to speak with God; he heard the Voice of one speaking to him, from off the Mercy Seat, from between the two Cherubims. Now here we may plainly see what the Object of Divine Worship was, not the Cherubim but the Invisible Majesty which spake from between them, and communed with Moses. The Mercy Seat it self was but the place where God had promised to meet them; The Cherubim were the Ornament, and covering of that, But neither the one nor the other of these were the Object of Divine Worship, or Figures or Similitudes of that God who alone was adored there,

Aquinas 12.
Q. 102. Art.
4. ad 6.

And this the Learned Men of the Church of Rome confess no less than we, Aquinas having objected against the Second Commandment, That the Cherubim were put in the Tabernacle and in the Temple: Answers that they were neither put there as representations of God, nor for any Worship to be paid to them. And explaining the Ark and all that belong'd to it as a Mystery, he says, That the Holy of Holies represented Heaven; The Ark was the Foot stool of the Divine Majesty; But that because God was Incomprehensible to any Creature, *propter hoc nulla Similitudo ejus ponebatur*, therefore was there no Similitude of him placed there the better to denote his Invisibility. As for the Cherubim he says they represented the multitude of Angels attending upon his Throne; and there was therefore more than One, that all worship might be excluded from them, to whom it had been commanded that they should worship onely one G O D. So far was Aquinas from thinking — that these Images were any Representations of God, or that any worship was to be paid to them, and the same has been confessed

confessed by others of no less note of that Church, *Vasquez Lorinus, Azorius* and even by his own *Visorius*, whom he has before alledged, but is not pleased to take notice of on this occasion.

But here our *Author* supposes he has something to boast of. For if we may believe him our own great *Defender* of this charge has given up the Cause as to this matter, and confessed that it was lawfull to worship TOWARDS an *Image*, but not to give worship to one. This is I fear a wilfull perverting of that *Learned man's* words. The *Question* was about the *Jews Adoration* towards the *Ark*, and the *holy of Holies*. His *Answer* is this; That they onely directed their worship towards the place, where God had promised to be signally present among them, which (says he) signifies no more to the worship of *Images*, than lifting up our *Eyes* to *Heaven* doth when we pray, because God is more especially present there. What is there in all this to allow it to be lawfull to give worship TOWARDS an *Image*, but not to it? Nay he plainly deni'd that there were any *Images* for worship there, or any worship directed towards them. But there was a *Symbol* of God's immediate presence as on his *Throne* between the *Cherubim*, and this appointed by God himself, and thither the people directed their worship, and I desire this *Author*, if he can, to tell me what there was more in this, than there is in directing our worship towards *Heaven* when we pray. And whether according to his true and onely *Notion* of *Idolatry*, he may not as well say that we worship *Apis* or *Baal* or *Moloch*, i. e. The *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, in this, as that the *Jews* worship'd the *Cherubim* by that?

Nor

Nor is there any more Sincerity in what he calls his *Second reply*, and in which he represents him as allowing that the *Cherubim might be Adored once a year by the high Priest, but not exposed to the people to worship*. For in that very place he denies the *Cherubim to have been any representations of God*, But says that his *Throne was between them on the Mercy Seat*; and adds in plain words, *That they were never intended for objects of worship*. And yet this *Author* insults and triumphs upon this, in a very glorious manner, as if the Cause had been gained by it. Had that *Learned Man* said that the *high Priest adored the Cherubims once a year*, then indeed there might have been some Colour for those sweet Expressions of *shameless shifts and pretences*. But this he utterly deny'd; and he might as well have made him confess it to be *lawfull to worship Images*, though he disputed against it, and have brought him in allowing that 'twas no *Idolatry* so to do, as to represent him confessing that the *high Priest adored the Cherubim once every year*. But what defence can there be against such *Adversaries*, as will make men *confess* what they *reject*, and *affirm* what they *deny*; and yet when they have done, dare to appeal both to *God* and the *World* for their *Sincerity*?

And now from what has been said, I will venture to conclude in behalf of our *Church*, and of those *Learned men* of our *Communion*, who have been concern'd in this *Controversy*, that the *Notion of Idolatry* which both the one *Teaches*, and the others have *Defended*, is after all this *Author's* *Clamours* against it neither *new* nor *unlearned*, nor *Fanatical*, nor *Anticatholick*, nor *Antichristian*, nor any of those ill things he pretends;

tends; but the truly *Ancient, Learned, and Catholic* Notion of it. The Notion which God in his Holy Word has Established; Which the *Jews* received; The *Apostles* taught, and the *Christian Church* till these latter days, that mens Interest prompted them to seek out to themselves new *Inventions*, constantly maintained. It was by this Notion that St. Paul censured the Worship of the *Golden Calf* as *Idolatrous*, and condemned the *Gentile World* of the same crime, *Rom. 1. 21, 23.* That though they knew God, yet they did not Glorify him as God, but changed the glory of the *Incorruptible God*, into an *Image* made like unto *Corruptible Man*, and to *Birds*, and *fourfooted Beasts* and *creeping things*.

This was the Notion that made our fore-runners in the *Faith*, chuse rather to suffer *Martyrdom* than to give *Religious worship* to any *Creature* whatsoever. And whatever this *Author* thinks of those *Primitive Saints*, I am confident he will find but very few besides, that will believe they Sacrificed their Lives to their *Folly and Passion*, and died onely to defend a mistaken Notion of *Idolatry*.

It was this Notion upon which the *Ancient Fathers* condemned the *Arians* of *Idolatry*; They did not believe *Christ*, to be either the *Sun* or *Moon*, or any other *visible* or *Corporeal Deity*, or the *Image*, of the *Supreme and invisible Godhead*. They believed him to be the most *Divine* and excellent *Being* after *God*, onely they denied that he was *Coeternal* and *Coequal* with the *Father*; and yet those *Holy, Orthodox Fathers* censur'd them as *Idolaters*, because supposing him to be a *Creature* they worshiped him as a *God*.

And upon the very same Notion it is that the *Reformed Churches* have ever looked upon the *worship* of *Images* and *Saints* in the *Church of Rome*, as deserving the very same censure; And I cannot but wonder that this *Author* should charge the Invention of this *Notion* upon a person *now living*, which he must needs have known both our *Church* and the *Writers* of it have constantly asserted, before any of this *Generation* ever saw the light.

I should now add somewhat in *Answer* to those *bitter reflexions* he has made upon the same *Reverend Person*, whom he seems to have resolved at any rate to run down: But though the *Charge* be severe, yet is it so inartificially laid, as plainly shews there was no *Achitophel* in the Contrivance; And I will onely say that who so shall consider the little Credit he had in those days, to which this *Author* refers, with them whom himself looks upon as the *Contrivers* and *Managers* of that *Plot* which he would be thought to lay to his *Charge*, will soon discover a great deal of *ill will* utterly ruined, for want of a little *skill* in the management of it.

But we ought not to wonder, if he who in the beginning of his Discourse flew out into such violence against all the Abettors of this *Charge* as a company of *Fanatick*, *Anti-monarchal Villains* has in the *Close* thought fit to fix some particular marks of his Displeasure, upon the last and most *Learned Assessor* of it. This was the least he could do to make amends for the misfortune of a approving and *Licensing* that *very Book* which was written in *Defence* of this *Charge*. And it is well for us all that there are some
men

men in the World, who as *Ulpian* tells us can do no injury, *Sive pulsent sive concivium dicant.*

How far this *Author* may be reckoned in the number of these I shall leave the final result of his Judgment in this case to satisfy the world, viz. That *Idolatry made the Plot, and the Plot made Idolatry, and the same persons made both.* For whether this can be the result of any man's Judgment that is well in his Head, I shall leave it to those who have no Distempers there to determine.

But he has delivered himself, as he will answer for his Integrity to God and the World. To this Judgment I now leave him: And though I fear it be too late to provide against the sentence of the Last, yet I heartily pray he may consider what he has done, and how he will stand in Judgment before the other.

FINIS.

(12)

Books lately Printed for Will. Rogers.

THE Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, truly Represented; in Answer to a Book intituled, *A Papist Misrepresented, and Represented, &c.* Quarto.

An Answer to a Discourse intituled, *Papists protesting against Protestant Popery*; being a Vindication of *Papists* not Misrepresented by *Protestants*: And containing a particular Examination of Monsieur *de Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in the Articles of *Invocation of Saints*, *Worship of Images*. occasioned by that Discourse. Quarto.

An Answer to the *Amicable Accommodation* of the Differences, between the *Representer* and *Answerer*. Quarto.

A View of the whole Controversie, between the *Representer* and the *Answerer*; with an Answer to the *Representer's* last *Reply*; in which are laid open some of the Methods, by which *Protestants* are Misrepresented by *Papists*. Quarto. The

A Catalogue of Books.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Transubstantiation*, compared as to *Scripture*, *Reason* and *Tradition*; in a new Dialogue between a *Protestant* and a *Papist*, the first Part: wherein an Answer is given to the late Proofs of the Antiquity of *Transubstantiation*, in the Books called, *Consensus Veterum*, and *Nubes Testium*, &c. Quarto.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and *Transubstantiation*, compared as to *Scripture*, *Reason* and *Tradition* in a new Dialogue between a *Protestant* and a *Papist*, the Second Part: Wherein the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is shewed to be agreeable, to *Scripture* and *Reason*, and *Transubstantiation* repugnant to both. Quarto.

An Answer to the Eighth Chapter of the *Representer's* Second Part, in the first Dialogue, between him and his Lay-Friend.

Of the Authority of *Councils*, and the Rule of *Faith*. By a Person of Quality: With an Answer to the Eight *Theses*, laid down for the Tryal of the *English Reformation*; in a Book that came lately from *Oxford*.

Sermons and Discourses, some of which
never

A Catalogue of Books

never before Printed : The third Volume.
By the Reverend Dr. *Tillotson*, Dean of *Canterbury*. Octavo.

A Manual for a *Christian* Souldier,
Written by *Erasmus*, and Translated into
Englisb. Twelves.

A new and easie Method to learn to *Sing*
by Book, whereby one (who hath a good
Voice and Ear) may without other help,
learn to *Sing* true by Notes. Design'd
chiefly for, and applied to the promoting
of *Psalmody*; and furnished with Variety of
Psalm-Tunes in Parts, with Directions for
that kind of *Singing*.

A Perswasive to frequent Communion
in the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*. By
John Tillotson, Dean of *Canterbury*, in Octa-
vo, Price Three Pence.

A Discourse against *Transubstantiation*. In
Octavo. Price Three Pence.

The State of the Church of *Rome* when
the Reformation began, as it appears by the
Advices given to *Paul III* and *Julius III* by
Creatures of their Own. With a Preface
leading to the matter of the Book. Quarto.

A Letter to a Friend, Reflecting on some
Passages

A Catalogue of Books.

Passages in a Letter to the D. of P. in Answer to the Arguing Part of his first Letter to Mr. G.

The *Reflector's* Defence of his Letter to a Friend, against the Furious Assaults of Mr. I. S. in his second Catholick Letter. In four Dialogues. Quarto.

A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Reverend *Benj. Calamy*, D. D. and late Minister of *St. Lawrance-Jury*, Lond. Jan. 7th. 1681. By *W. Sherlock*. D. D. Master of the Temple.

A Vindication of some Protestant Principles of Church-Unity and Catholick-Communion, from the Charge of Agreement with the Church of *Rome*. In Answer to a late Pamphlet, Intituled, *An Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, evinced from the Concertation of some of her Sons with their Brethren the Dissenters*. By *William Sherlock*, D. D. Master of the Temple.

A Preservative against Popery: being some Plain Directions to unlearned Protestants, how to Dispute with *Romish* Priests. The first Part by *William Sherlock*, D. D. Master of the Temple.